

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate John W. Malcolm,

Address 476, Lanark Road, Juniper Green, Midlothian.

Degree Ph.D. Date 30th. April, 1963.

Title of Thesis MAPTYPHA and Authority in the New Testament.

The source of the New Testament $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ -concept is the Old Testament, especially the Septuagint. The etymological meaning of $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ is 'one who remembers or reminds'; this emerges in various OT passages where the $\mu\alpha\epsilon\tau\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$ or $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ is the standing reminder of a covenant and its implications. The supreme $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ is God himself; he is the source of the Biblical testimony and his Spirit testifies to the mind of the believer.

The original testimony was delivered to Moses and summarised in his Song (Dt. 31 and 32). The priests and official prophets were made the servants of the tabernacle of testimony and part of their duty was to guard and transmit this testimony. Later, official and unofficial prophets were sent by God to testify to Israel and remind her of the covenant-doctrine given at the time of the Exodus. The OT torah or $\mu\alpha\epsilon\tau\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$ has many synonyms but its content remains constant within a framework of four main themes, viz. (a) The sovereignty of the one creator God, (b) His moral law, (c) His redemptive activity and (d) His promise of future blessedness or doom.

The true $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ is the bearer of the original testimony and, as such is dependent for his authority on the self-authenticating truth of his message; he may, in some instances, be an ecstatic but essentially he is a teacher of eternally valid truths. The authority of the $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ is that of the teacher of the truth of God and so can have no official sanctions.

The prophetic testimony or lore of the OT prophets was transmitted by John the Baptist who pointed to its fulfilment in Jesus. Jesus was the true and faithful witness who recalled Israel to the authentic doctrine which had been distorted and debased by the official leaders, and pointed to himself as the embodiment of it.

Jesus chose his disciples to instruct them in his testimony. On his departure they became the prophetic, charismatic leaders of the new Israel and guardians of the testimony and they transmitted it to others who also became $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\upsilon\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ and servants of the word. Jesus' testimony and that of his disciples has the same four-fold content as that of the OT fulfilled in the person and life of Jesus.

The $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ is not simply an eye-witness who recounts what he has seen, he is one who has 'seen' the action and truth of God in sensible phenomena. The content of his testimony is both event

and truth, the former without the latter has no spiritual significance and the latter without the former is suspended in a vacuum.

This investigation of the NT μαρτυρία has served to underline the weakness (1) of the Catholic view that the leaders of the earliest Church depended for their authority simply on the dominical commission and their position as eye-witnesses of the words and works of Jesus and that it was possible for them to transmit this authority to their successors in office and (2) of the 'Formgeschichte' thesis that "He (Jesus) who formerly had been the bearer of the message was drawn into it and became its essential content." (Bultmann).

True authority in the Church is vested in Jesus Christ himself who is both witness and testimony; it is a charismatic authority resting on him who is the truth - "the same yesterday, today and for ever."

(1)

Ματθεΐα and Authority in the New Testament.

by John W. Malcolm, M.A., B.D.

A Thesis presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
of the University of Edinburgh in the Faculty of Divinity,
15th. May, 1963.



The writer wishes to record here his gratitude to Professor J.S. Stewart and Professor A. Barr who supervised the work for their wise direction, mature advice and kindly encouragement. His thanks are also due to the Library Staffs of New College and Edinburgh University for their courtesy and helpfulness.

TABLE OF CONTENTSPART ICHAPTER I

	<u>Page</u>
<u>THE BACKGROUND OF THE <i>Maeros</i> WORD-GROUP</u>	1
(1) ETYMOLOGY.....	1
(2) MEANING AND USAGE IN NON-BIBLICAL GREEK.....	2
(3) MEANING IN THE SEPTUAGINT.....	11

CHAPTER II

<u>THE CONCEPT OF TESTIMONY IN THE LXX</u>	14
(1) GENERAL USAGE.....	14
(2) THE PENTATEUCH.....	18
(3) THE EIGHTH CENTURY PROPHETS.....	30
(4) THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.....	36
(5) THE BOOK OF PSALMS.....	42
(6) THE WISDOM LITERATURE.....	45
(1) THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.....	45
(ii) THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON AND SIRACH.....	50
(7) JOB.....	56
(8) THE EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC PROPHETS.....	57
(9) JUDITH, SUSANNAH AND I AND II MACCABEES.....	73

CHAPTER III

<u>THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF THE OLD TESTAMENT</u>	77
--	----

CHAPTER IV

<u>THE MISHNAH</u>	99
--------------------------	----

CHAPTER V

<u>THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS</u>	110
-----------------------------------	-----

PART II

<u>CHAPTER VI</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>THE PROPHECIC TESTIMONY OF JOHN THE BAPTIST</u>	126.
<u>CHAPTER VII</u>	
<u>THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS IN THE SYNOPTICS AND ACTS.....</u>	133
<u>CHAPTER VIII</u>	
<u>THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL.....</u>	153
<u>CHAPTER IX</u>	
<u>OTHER TESTIMONY IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.....</u>	166
<u>CHAPTER X</u>	
<u>TESTIMONY OTHER THAN THAT OF THE BAPTIST AND JESUS IN</u> <u>THE FOURTH GOSPEL.....</u>	205
<u>CHAPTER XI</u>	
<u>TESTIMONY IN THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES.....</u>	218
(1) I JOHN.....	218
(2) II JOHN.....	230
(3) III JOHN.....	231
<u>CHAPTER XII</u>	
<u>TESTIMONY IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.....</u>	234

<u>CHAPTER XIII</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>THE TESTIMONY OF PAUL AND HIS DISCIPLES AND</u>	
<u>COMPANIONS</u>	299
(1) I AND II THESSALONIANS.....	299
(2) I AND II CORINTHIANS.....	313
(3) ROMANS.....	347
(4) GALATIANS.....	355
(5) THE PRISON EPISTLES.....	364
(6) THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.....	373
<u>CHAPTER XIV</u>	
<u>TESTIMONY IN THE GENERAL EPISTLES OF JAMES, PETER</u>	
<u>AND JUDE</u>	396
(1) JAMES.....	396
(2) PETER AND JUDE.....	397
<u>CHAPTER XV</u>	
<u>TESTIMONY IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS</u>	412
<u>CHAPTER XVI</u>	
<u>TESTIMONY IN THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN</u>	426
<u>CHAPTER XVII</u>	
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	450
<u>ADDITIONAL NOTES</u>	460

	<u>Page</u>
(A) Aspects of the Discussion of the <i>Μαῖνος</i> - Concept since 1859.....	460
(B) The Organisation of the Early Church.....	471
(C) The Bearing of the <i>Μαῖνοειά</i> -Concept on Bultmann's Existentialist View of the Historical Jesus and the Preaching of the Early Church and on Recent Developments in the Direction of a New Quest of the Historical Jesus.....	474
<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	497
(1) Works Directly Concerned with the Subject of Testimony.....	497
(2) General.....	503
(3) Commentaries.....	513
(4) Books and Reference.....	517
<u>PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS</u>	519

1.

PART I

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND OF THE Μάρτυς⁽¹⁾ WORD-GROUP

(1) ETYMOLOGY

The word-group of which μαρτυρία is a member is thought to be linked by the common root μαρ, μαε, with μέε-μηε-α, μέε-ι-μνα (care); μερ-μαίρ-ω, μερμερ-ίζω (to care). This root stems from the Sanscrit root smar (smarami, to remember, think; smrti-s, smar-ana-m, memory, remembrance; smar-a-s, recollection, remembrance, love). There is an affinity here with the Zend: mar (to remember, know, mention) and mar-e-ti (a precept) and also with the Latin: memor (memory).⁽²⁾ "Hence, literally, a μάρτυς is one who remembers, i.e. one who has information or knowledge of a thing and can therefore give information concerning, bring to light, or confirm anything."⁽³⁾ In the following study of the μάρτυς -group it will be seen that this basic meaning of 'remembering' is of primary importance in those instances where the concept is used in a sense other than the legal one.

(1) Three forms other than the Attic μάρτυς are found, viz. Cretan: μαῖτυς ; e.g. Gort. Inscr. 11.16: δέκα στατήρας κατατάσει αὐτὴν ἀποπώνῃ μαῖτυς, Old Epic: μάρτυρος ; e.g. Hom. Odes 16.423: οὐδ' ἱκέτας ἐμπάττει, οἷσιν ἄρα Ζεὺς μάρτυρος. Also several times in inscriptions, especially those at Delphi, concerning the enfranchisement of slaves under the form of sale to a god; e.g. CIG. I.702: μάρτυροι Εὐχίῃ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος Ἀρχίων καὶ Ἀθαμβος. Aeolic: μάρτυρ ; e.g. Ditt. Syll. III. 953.22f: ὁ δὲ μάρτυρ, ὁ μὲν δυνατὸς εὖν, παρῆμιν, μαρτυρεῖτω... (2) See Curtius: Principles of Greek Etymology, I.399 and Asting: Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum, p. 525: "Die Grund-bedeutung von μάρτυς ist also: einer der denkt und sich erinnert." γύμ means originally to turn back, return and then to repeat (Gesenius DCX). This is close to the idea of remembering or reminding which is, in a sense, a re-producing of past events, words or ideas. (3) Bullinger: A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament, p. 893, col. 1.

(2) MEANING AND USAGE IN NON-BIBLICAL GREEK

Μαρτυρεῖν in the active voice usually denotes the function of the witness; someone or something testifies for someone or something else.⁽¹⁾ The word also means to bear favourable witness to, to give a good report of a person or thing,⁽²⁾ to testify of a thing,⁽³⁾ to confirm what another says,⁽⁴⁾ to testify that a thing is,⁽⁵⁾ to give evidence⁽⁶⁾ and to furnish proof.⁽⁷⁾

- (1) e.g. Pindar bears witness for Hagesias: (Olympian Odes 6.21) a bloodstained robe bears witness for Orestes (Aesch. Chorus Bearers 1010), Apollo testifies for Orestes (Aesch. Eumen. 594); all Hellas bears witness for the Corinthians, Herod. 8.94; Homer testifies that despots commit the greatest offences (Plato. Gorgias 525D). There are frequent examples of this use of the word in the legal sense in the papyri, eg. in wills (P. Oxy. 105.13: Σαραπίων..... μαρτυρῶ τῇ τοῦ Πεκύσι[ος] διαθήκῃ. deeds of gift (P. Gren. 68.21: Ἀνδρέλιος Φιλοσάραπις Ἀπολλωνίου μαρτυρῶ. notes of hand (Excavations at Deuro-Europos, VI.425: Ἀριαβάτος Ἀριαβάδου μαρτυρεῖ, records of sales and receipts (P. Lond. III.1164f. 35: Ἡλιο[δ]ωρος Ἑρμίου Παυλινίου ο καὶ Φιλαδελφίδος μαρτυρῶ. The Amherst Papyrus provides an example of the word used with reference to eye-witness (P. Amh. 2.66.34 (cf. 38): Στοτοήτιος λέγοντος ἔνκεκλ[η]κέναι τοῖς ἐπὶ Σαταβοῦ φόνοῦ ἐπ[ὶ] τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ παρῆναι τοὺς μαρτυρῆσαι δυναμένους τῶν φό[ων].
- (2) eg. Dio Chrysostom: Discourses 40.19: καὶ μὴν ὅστις ἀνδροθυμῆται τὰ περὶ τὴν πόλιν.... ἔμε πρῶτον ἔξει τὸν μαρτυροῦν καὶ συναγωνιζόμενον; Aelian: Various History. 1.30: πολλάκις γοῦν αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Πτολεμαῖος ἐμαρτύρε καὶ ἔλεγεν· ὦ ἀγαθὴ κεφαλὴ. and P. Oxy. 930.16f: ἐμαρτύρει δὲ πολλὰ περὶ τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ σου.
- (3) eg. Dionysius Halicarnassensis. 3.67.1: ἐπίλεξας ἄνδρας ἑκατόν.... οἷς ἀρετὴν τινα πολεμικὴν.... ἀπαντες ἐμαρτύρουν. and P. Oxy. 494.32f: Δίδυμος.... ἰς τῶν μαρτυρησάντων τῇ προκιμένη διαθήκῃ
- (4) eg. Xen. Memorabilia 1.2.20: κ' αὖν δὲ μαρτυρῶ τοῖς (the poets).
- (5) eg. Soph. Oed. Col. 1265: καὶ μαρτυρῶ κάκιστος ἀνθρώπων τροφαῖς ταῖς σαῖσιν ἤκειν.
- (6) eg. Demosthenes. 1300.16: ὥστε οὐδὲ μαρτυρεῖν ἀκοὴν ἔωσιν οἱ νόμοι πρὸς ἄφοβον.
- (7) eg. Xen. Symp. 8.12: βούλομαι αὐτῷ μαρτυρῆσαι ὡς.....

In the passive, μαρτυρεῖν is often impersonal and means: testimony is borne by, ⁽¹⁾ to be ascribed to, ⁽²⁾ to bear a character for ⁽³⁾ and to be well spoken of. ⁽⁴⁾

Μαρτυρεσθαι has been translated as: to call to witness, to invoke (especially of the gods). ⁽⁵⁾ With this meaning the word really requires a statement, the testimony of the witness, and when this is lacking it takes the meaning: to protest, asseverate, ⁽⁶⁾ cite as witness, ⁽⁷⁾ remind, ⁽⁸⁾ charge solemnly ⁽⁹⁾ and declare solemnly. ⁽¹⁰⁾

(1) eg. Plato. Protag. 344D: τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἐσθλῷ ἐγχεῖται κακῷ γενέσθαι, ὥσπερ καὶ παρ' ἄλλου ποιητοῦ μαρτυρεῖται τοῦ εἰπόντος

(2) eg. Dion. Halic. 2.26: οἷς πολλὴ μαρτυρεῖται σοφία.

(3) eg. Athenaeus. Deipnosophistae. 1.25.e,f: μαρτυροῦνται γὰρ καὶ χῖοι οὐκ ἕλλαττον τῶν προειρημένων ἐπὶ ὀφθαλμικῇ

(4) eg. Inscriptiones Antiquae Orae Septentrionalis Ponti Euxini Graecae et Latinae. 21.26-28: ἀλλὰ καὶ (μέχρι) περάτων γῆς ἐμαρτυρήθη τοὺς ὑπὲρ φιλίας κινδύνους μέχρι Σεβαστῶν συμμαχία παραβολεύσασθαι.

(5) eg. in the legal sense: P. Oxy. 1114.23: Μάρκος Αὐγέλιος Ἐραῖς γυμνασιαρχήσας..... ἐμαρτύρετο τοὺς τότε τὸ μαρτυρο-ποίημα σφραγίσσειν μέλλοντας.

(6) eg. Aristoph. Clouds 1222: μαρτυρομαι ὅτι ἐς δ' εἶπεν ἡμέρας.

(7) eg. Plato. Republic. 364D: οἱ δὲ τῆς τῶν θεῶν ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων παραγωγῆς τὸν Ὅμηρον μαρτυροῦνται ὅτι καὶ ἐκεῖνος εἶπε.

(8) eg. Appian. Civil War. 5.129: τοὺς μὲν ἀποστάντας ἐμαρτύρετο.

(9) This is the translation preferred by Hort at Eph. 4.17 and I Thess. 2.11f. (The First Epistle of St. Peter pp53f). According to Lightfoot μαρτυρομαι never means 'to bear witness to' in the NT any more than in classical Greek but examples of this usage

appear in the Koiné; eg. P. Oxy. 1120.11: κατὰ τοῦτο μαρτυρομαι τὴν βίαν γυνὴ χῆρα καὶ ἀισθενής., and also P. Amh. II.

141.17 and P. Strass. I.5.14: βιβλία ἐπιδιδώκαμεν τῷ [στ]ρατηγῷ

(10) eg. Plato. Philebus 47C. (ταῦτα μαρτυρομένοι.

Μαρτυρία has the basic meaning of testifying, the coming forward as witness but it also takes the meaning of evidence, the statement of the μάρτυς ⁽¹⁾. Anaximenes of Lampsakos opens his discussion of evidence by defining it as an admission voluntarily made by one who knows the facts. ⁽²⁾ Other meanings found are: commendation (in a non-legal sense) ⁽³⁾ and, in the plural: demonstrations of favour; ⁽⁴⁾ The word is also used in the phrase: To serve with a sub-poena. ⁽⁵⁾

Μαρτύριον, used often in the plural, has no special forensic affinities; it denotes the objective testimony ⁽⁶⁾ or proof ⁽⁷⁾ which can be brought forward to confirm the truth of a statement or as proof of a fact and has a distinctively objective character, being always concerned with facts; ⁽⁸⁾ later it came to mean a martyr's shrine. ⁽⁹⁾

(1) This distinction comes out clearly in P. Hal. I.2. 222-225:
Εἴς] μαρτυρίαν καλεῖσθαι ἐναντίον δύο κλη]τόρων (222-224)
where μαρτυρία means the actual giving of testimony and ὁ δὲ
καλεσάμενος γράφει τὴν μαρτυρίαν εἰς π[λυν]ακίον] (224-225)
where it means the content.

(2) Rhetorica ad Alexandrum, 1431.b.20: μαρτυρία δ' ἐστὶν
ὁμολογία συνειδότης ἐκόντος.

(3) eg. Ditt. Syll. III., 1073. 17-19: ὡς πάσης αὐτὸν μαρτυρίας
ἐπὶ σωφροσύνη... παρὰ πᾶσιν ἐπιτήδειον νομίζεσθαι.

(4) eg. P. Oxy. I.41.18: τὰς δὲ τοιαύταις] μαρτυρίας ἀξιῶ
εἰς καιρὸν εὖνομον ὑπερετεθῆναι.

(5) eg. Aeschines, 1.45: ἐπειδὴ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ ἐσμέν γέγραφα
μαρτυρίαν τῷ Μισγόλῳ.

(6) eg. Pindar. Isth. Odes., 1.4.10: μαρτύρια φθιμένων ζῶων
τε φωτῶν ἀπλέτου δόξας.

(7) eg. Herod., 8.120: μέγα δὲ καὶ τόδε μαρτύριον χεῖσθαι ὅτι ποιητής....

(8) Strathmann (KWB. IV. 480.19-22): "Bei μαρτύριον dagegen tritt eine spezifische Affinität zur Sphäre des Prozesswesens oder überhaupt des Rechtslebens nicht hervor. Es bezeichnet das objektive Zeugnis, den Beweis, der zur Bestätigung der Richtigkeit einer Aussage, zum Beweis einer Tatsache beigebracht werden kann." This is correct as long as 'Beweis' means proof within the limits of faith.

(9) Kaibel: Epigrammata Graeca, 1963.6: [... ὠκοδομήθη τὸ
μαρ[τ]ύριον μαίω τῇ ἐ[πο]λ[εως] ἐ[τει]. and P. Oxy., 6.941.1:
ἀντὶς τοῦ μαρτύριου.

Μάρτυς throughout non-Biblical Greek has the meaning of a witness, one who from direct personal experience of a situation in which he participated or was present, is in a position to testify about people and circumstances, and does so.⁽¹⁾ The word is used for proof-witness in a law-suit,⁽²⁾ as solemnity-witness,⁽³⁾ in miscellaneous legal business⁽⁴⁾ and in the non-legal sense of one who gives a supporting opinion;⁽⁵⁾ Epictetus uses the word in the special sense of one who bears a divine message.⁽⁶⁾

Ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν means to bear witness;⁽⁷⁾ συμμαρτυρεῖν has the sense of to bear witness to something or someone with or in accordance with another.⁽⁸⁾ Συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν means to join in attesting or ratifying.⁽⁹⁾ Καταμαρτυρεῖν means to bear witness against someone⁽¹⁰⁾ or to assert concerning someone or something.⁽¹¹⁾ Διαμαρτύρεσθαι has practically the same meaning as μαρτύρεσθαι viz. to call god or man to witness,⁽¹²⁾ to protest,⁽¹³⁾

(1) Strathmann. KWB. IV, 479.3-6

(2) eg. Plato. Republic. 340A: καὶ τί, ἔφη, δεῖται μάρτυρος; αὐτὸς γὰρ Θρασύμαχος ὁμολογεῖ τρὺς μὲν ἄρχοντας....

(3) eg. Gort. Inscr. xi-xiii: αἱ δ' ἀννίστο μὴ ἄγεν, τὸν δικαστὴν ἐκνύοντα κελίμεν, αἱ κὲ ἀποπονίοι μαίτους.

(4) eg. Plato. Laws. 953E: ἐγγύην, ἣν ἂν ἐγγυᾶται τις, διαρρήδην ἐγγυᾶσθω.... καὶ ἐναντίον μαρτύρων.

(5) Aristot. Ars Rhet. 1.15.13: Ἀθηναῖοι Ὀμήω μάρτυρι ἐχρήσαντο περὶ Σαλαμῖνος.

(6) Disc. 1.29.46-47: ὡς μάρτυς, ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κεκλήμενος, ἔρχου σύ καὶ μαρτυρήσόν μοι· σὺ γὰρ ἄξιός περ ἀχθῆναι μάρτυς ὑπ' ἐμοῦ.

(7) eg. Plato. Crat. 397A: ἵνα εἰδῶμεν εἰ ἄρα ἡμῖν ἐπιμαρτυρήσει αὐτὰ τὰ ὀνόματα.

(8) eg. Plut. Moralia. 64C: δεῖ τῷ φίλῳ..... συμμαρτυρεῖν.

(9) eg. Polyb. 26.9.4: καὶ συνεπιμαρτυροῦντων τοῖς Δαρεβάνοις.

(10) eg. Mitteis-Wilcken: Papyruskunde II.ii.31; V.32,33: ὥστε ὁμολογουμένως ἑαυτοῦ καταμαρτυροῦντα συμφανὲς καθεστακέναι.

(11) eg. Plotinus. Enneades. 5.5.13.12,13: εἴαστε τὸ ἔστιν οὐδεὶ καταμαρτυρήσας τῶν οὐ παρόντων.

(12) eg. Demosth. 232.28: σοὶ τὸ μὴ σιγῆσαι λοιπὸν ἦν, ἀλλὰ

(13) eg. Aesch. 2.89: καὶ διαμαρτυρεῖσθαι καὶ δηλοῦν τοῖσι. καὶ διαμαρτυρεῖσθαι Φιλίππῳ ταῦτα μὴ ποιεῖν.

to beg earnestly or conjure.⁽¹⁾ Προμαρτύρεσθαι is found for the first time outside the New Testament in a papyrus of the eighth century in the sense of 'to urge in advance to something'.⁽²⁾ Ἀπομαρτύρεσθαι = 'maintain stoutly' in Plat. Soph 237A.

Generally speaking, the following kinds of testimony are found in non-Biblical Greek: (1) The Testimony of the Solemnity Witness. In The Gortynian Inscription (c. 450 B.C.), the only authentic record of the earlier stages of Greek Law, testimony is used in a formal, technical sense. At the preliminary hearing of a lawsuit the judge gives judgement κατὰ μαρτύραν ἔ ἀπόμωτων.⁽³⁾ "The witnesses, however, are not witnesses to any fact; they are formal witnesses to the proper performance of certain formal processual acts required by law."⁽⁴⁾ "Das gortynische Recht kennt.....keine zufälligen Zeugen sondern nur Eidhelfer und 'gezogene' oder Solemnitätszeugen";⁽⁵⁾ (these are the co-juror or compurgator of early German law). Headlam points out that at Athens the law of evidence never really progressed and that the old rule was maintained that μαρτυρεῖν belonged to the preliminary and formal proceedings.⁽⁶⁾ When the earlier procedure was replaced by written records the use of the words for witness underwent an extension.

(1) eg. Xen. Cyropaedia. 7.1.17: καὶ σὺ μὴ πρότερον ἔμβαλλε τοῖς ἐναντίοις διαμαρτύρομαι

(2) eg. P. Lond. 4.1356.32,33: προμαρτυρόμενος (αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ xi. 26,28. σχεῖν τὸν φόβον τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν.

(4) Headlam (The Procedure of the Gortynian Inscription 51.22ff):

"Before a man can bring a case into court he has to go through certain formalities; these must be performed before witnesses μαρτύρες. The presence of the witnesses is necessary to the validity of the acts and their statement is the proof required by the law that the acts have been performed. E.g. in a dispute concerning the ownership of a slave, disobedience of an order of restitution incurs a penalty. If the slave has taken sanctuary in a temple so that he cannot be restored and the loser of the case takes the rightful owner or his agent to the temple and shows him the slave before two witnesses called for the purpose he will have to pay only the price of the slave. The owner could not sue for the penalty. (Gort. Inscr. I. 38-43).

(5) Latte: Heiliges Recht, 28.2.

(6) op. cit., p. 62. 36ff.

(ii) The Testimony of the Eye- and Ear-witness is found from the earliest times, used of gods⁽¹⁾ and of men.⁽²⁾ Aristotle in his discussion of evidence in The Art of Rhetoric rather disparages those witnesses who "share the risk of the trial" on the grounds that "such only serve to establish whether an act has taken place or not. As to its quality, just or unjust etc., they are not competent. But ancient witnesses are the most trustworthy of all for they cannot be corrupted."⁽³⁾

(iii) The Testimony of an Opinion or Truth. A significant extension of the use of the word is introduced by Aristotle in the context just mentioned when he states that one should appeal to the interpreters of oracles for testimony concerning the future and that proverbs are evidence⁽⁴⁾ and Plato employs a similar connotation in The Laws⁽⁵⁾ when he speaks of the choir of those under thirty invoking Apollo Paian as witness of the truth of what is said: Strathmann makes the important observation. "Dass die Wörter μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία beide Bedeutungen (fact-witness and opinion - or truth-witness) umfassen, ist für ihre weitere Geschichte von entscheidender Bedeutung."⁽⁶⁾

(1) eg Homer. Iliad 3.280: Σέῳ πάτερ.....καὶ ποταμοὶ...ὅμεις μάρτυροί. ἐστέ, φυλάσσετε δ' ὅδε κ' ἀπιστά.

(2) ib. 1.338: τῷ δ' αὐτῷ μάρτυροι ἔστων. πρὸς τὰ θεῶν μακάρων πρὸς τὰ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.....εἴ ποτε δὴ αὐτὴ χρεὶν γένηται

(3) 1.15.16,17: οἱ μὲν οὖν τοιοῦτοι τῶν τοιούτων μόνον μάρτυρες εἰσιν, εἰ γέγονεν ἢ μή, εἰ ἔστιν ἢ μή, περὶ δὲ τοῦ ποῖον οὐ μάρτυρες, οἷον, εἰ δίκαιον ἢ ἀδίκον, εἰ συμφέρον ἢ ἀσύμφερον. οἱ δ' ἅπωθεν καὶ περὶ τούτων πιστότατοι. πιστότατοι δ' οἱ παλαιοὶ ἀδιάφθοροι γὰρ.

(4) 1.15.14: περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν γεγομένων οἱ τοιοῦτοι μάρτυρες (πρὶνταί κ.τ.λ.) περὶ δὲ τῶν ἔσομένων καὶ οἱ χρησμολόγοι... ἔτι καὶ παροιμίαι... μαρτυρία ἔστιν.

(5) 6640: τὸν τε Παιᾶνα ἐπικαλούμενος μάρτυρα τῶν λεγομένων ἀληθείας.

(6) Strathmann. KWB. IV. 484.34-36.

(iv) The Testimony of the Cynic Philosopher. Epictetus introduces a special meaning of 'witness' in stating that the Cynic philosopher proves himself a witness of God and of the insignificance of the outward things of this passing world when he meets all adversity with equanimity.⁽¹⁾ Geffken⁽²⁾ avers: "Das Wort μάρτυς, das die meisten Menschen nur aus dem christlichen Sprachgebrauche kennen, hat rein philosophischen Ursprung." He quotes 1. 29,47; 3. 24,112 and concludes: "Hier also, hier allein haben wir den Ursprung des Begriffes, das Urbild von des Märtyrers Wesen." Strathmann⁽³⁾ concludes that any similarity to the Christian sense of the term is merely apparent (this view would seem to be well supported by Epictetus' reference to the barrier imposed on such witnessing by ill-health)⁽⁴⁾ and justifiably contrasts the Cynic witness-concept unfavourably with that of Deutero-Isaiah.⁽⁵⁾

A study of the meaning of the μάρτυς -group in non-Biblical Greek has shown that the principal and most significant meanings are those of witness of a fact that has occurred in the experience of the witness and the testimony of an opinion which he holds or a truth of which he is convinced.

(1) Discourses 3.24.113: πένητα δείκνυσσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, δόξα ἀρχῆς νοσοῦντα. Εἰς Γύαρεα ἀποστέλλει, εἰς δεσμωτήριον ἐσάγει..

(2) Hermes 45(1910).p. 496.

(3) Strathmann says that Epictetus' usage is "ein gelegentlich gebrauchtes Bild für ein Tatbekenntnis zu einer Wahrheit."

(4) Discourses. 3,22.88: "The Philosopher must show how his simple life keeps him in good health. 'Look', he says: καὶ τούτου μάρτυς εἰμὶ ἐγὼ καὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἐμόν.

(5) KWB. IV. 487f.

A witness, then, is a person, or a thing personified, serving to provide information useful for arriving at facts or the truth. The degree of authority of the witness is the degree to which that witness is successful in compelling belief in the facts or assent to the truth. Where the object of testimony is an event that has taken place the only possible valid authority is the ear- or eye-witness but his authority depends on his reliability. This weakness may be offset by weight of numbers but there is always the possibility of false witnesses being produced in quantity⁽¹⁾. To guard against corruption, oaths were taken in the name of the gods and this was generally a sufficient guarantee of the truth of statements as long as men believed in the possibility of divine retribution. Perjury was always regarded as a heinous crime⁽²⁾.

(¹) Cf. Plato. Gorgias 471 Ef, where Socrates says to Polus: "You attempt to refute me in the rhetorical fashion, as they understand refuting in the lawcourts. For there one party is supposed to refute the other when they bring forward a number of reputable witnesses (μάστινας πολλούς καὶ εὐδοκίμους) to any statements they may make whilst their opponent produces only one or none. But this sort of refutation is quite worthless for getting at the truth, since occasionally a man may actually be crushed by the number and reputation of the false witnesses brought against him." Cf. The Laws. 1.638D.

(²) Aristotle. Ars Rhet. 1.14.6: καὶ τὸ ἐνταῦθα οὐ κολάζονται οἱ ἀδικοῦντες, ὥστε ποιοῦσιν οἱ ψευδομαρτυροῦντες· ποῦ γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ἀδικήσεν, εἰ γε καὶ ἐν τῷ δικάστηϊ;

Although Aristotle may play down the value of the 'recent witnesses' or witnesses of fact, especially the testimony of "those whose opinions are not held in high esteem"⁽¹⁾ and although slaves and women were not usually accepted as witnesses in Greek law-courts, the evidence of quite ordinary people actually was relied upon by courts of international law⁽²⁾. It would seem then that the authority of the witness of facts depends ultimately on trust on the part of the receiver of the testimony; for it to have an objective authority it must be believed, taken on trust.

Where a truth or opinion is in question the witness is dependent for his authority upon his own character and behaviour, his sincerity and the intensity of his conviction, the support he can muster from other authorities, past and present, and the logic of his appeals to reason. Here again there arises the necessity of trust on the part of the receiver; the requirement of a corresponding belief on the part of the other who must come to see the matter in the same light and be influenced by it in the same way.

(1) As distinct from the ancient witnesses who are incorruptible (πρεῖ δὲ μαρτύρων, μαρτυρεῖς εἰσὶ διττοί, οἱ μὲν παλαιοί, αἱ δὲ πρόσφατοι ... λέγω δὲ παλαιοὺς μὲν τοὺς τε ποιητὰς καὶ ὄσων ἄλλων γυναικῶν εἰσὶ κρίσεις φανεραί. (Ars Rhet. 1.15.13)) and from recent witnesses whose opinion is valuable (πρόσφατοι δ' ὅσοι γυναικοὶ τι κεκρίκασιν· χεῖριστοι γὰρ αἱ τούτων κρίσεις τοῖς περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀμφισβητοῦσιν. 1.15.15)).

(2) Tod (International Arbitration among the Greeks, p 148f.) gives an example from a boundary dispute between Condaea and an unknown state. (CIG. 9.2.52; 5-18; 19-30; 30-37) and continues: "The passages which survive show that such boundary suits were not settled entirely by reference to poets and historians and official documents but that the evidence of shepherds and fishermen who had pursued their humble calling in the immediate neighbourhood of the disputed territory, also had a share in deciding these momentous contests."

(3) MEANING IN THE SEPTUAGINT⁽¹⁾

Μάρτυς is used to translate מֵדָעָה⁽²⁾ and מֵדָעָה מֵדָעָה⁽³⁾, a Chaldaean and Syrian word meaning witness or testimony. Anything may serve as a witness or as evidence, e.g. a heap of stones for the covenant between Jacob and Laban.⁽⁴⁾ A person may be a witness, e.g. God for Samuel.⁽⁵⁾ Witnesses are used in the transfer of property,⁽⁶⁾ at betrothals,⁽⁷⁾ as eye-witnesses⁽⁸⁾ and ear-witnesses,⁽⁹⁾ very often as witnesses for the prosecution.

Μαρτυρεῖν is used to translate the verbs: (a) מֵדָעָה meaning to say again and again, to witness or exhort;⁽¹⁰⁾ the passive is used occasionally meaning to testify, to affirm solemnly.⁽¹¹⁾ (b) מֵדָעָה meaning to testify against someone.⁽¹²⁾

(1) All OT references are taken from Rahlfs: Septuaginta unless otherwise stated.

(2) e.g. Nu.5.13.

(3) Gen.31.47. See Skinner I.C.C. p. 401 n. Μάρτυς is also used to translate מֵדָעָה = witness in Job 16.19.

(4) e.g. Gen.31.44.

(5) e.g. I K.12.5.

(6) e.g. Jer.39.10.

(7) e.g. Ru.4.9-11.

(8) e.g. Nu.5.13.

(9) e.g. Lev.5.1.

(10) e.g. Dt.19.18.

(11) Gen.43.3; Ex 21.36 (Cod. B).

(12) e.g. Nu.35.30.

Μαρτυρία is used to translate: (a) מִן meaning an appointed time,⁽¹⁾ (b) עֵד meaning testimony,⁽²⁾ (c) תִּפְעֻלָּה meaning the testimony, i.e. the law or torah,⁽³⁾ and (d) אֲפֻרָּה meaning testimony.⁽⁴⁾

Μαρτύριον is used to translate: (a) מִן meaning a set time or place, very often in the phrases: ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου⁽⁵⁾ and ἡ κιβωτὸς τοῦ μαρτυρίου,⁽⁶⁾ (b) עֵד meaning a witness (used of things)⁽⁷⁾ and also in the plural, meaning testimonies⁽⁸⁾ (always used of the law of God which bears witness to his character, will, activity and purpose), (c) תִּפְעֻלָּה meaning testimony,⁽⁹⁾ (d) אֲפֻרָּה meaning a law or a custom which must be kept⁽¹⁰⁾ and (e) עֵד meaning a testimony.⁽¹¹⁾

Διαμαρτυρία occurs in the LXX translation of the phrase מִן עֵד⁽¹²⁾ and also in IV Macc. 16.16.

(1) I K. 9.24. The translation μαρτυρία in Cod. A. is wrong and is probably due to the translator's connecting מִן and עֵד.

(2) e.g. Ex. 20.16 used of false witness.

(3) e.g. Ps. 18.8.

(4) Gen. 31.47 (Dsil and E). The distinction between μαρτυρία and μαρτύριον as between testifying and testimony is not seen in the LXX which the NT writers used so much. In all eleven occurrences μαρτυρία means the testimony rather than the testifying.

(5) e.g. Ex. 27.21.

(6) Ex. 35.12. In these two phrases there is a mis-translation of the Heb. text. See Strathmann, KWB. IV. 485. 26f. and 485. 36f. cf. I K. 9.24; 13.8, 11; 20.35.

(7) e.g. Gen. 21.30.

(8) e.g. Dt. 4.45.

(9) e.g. Ex. 31.18.

(10) e.g. Ru. 4.7.

(11) e.g. Dt. 31.26.

(12) Gen. 43.3.

Καταμαρτυρεῖν⁽¹⁾ is used to translate: (a) קָדַם meaning to testify against,⁽²⁾ (b) קָדַם (followed by קָדַם) meaning to testify⁽³⁾ and (c) קָדַם קָדַם meaning to accuse.⁽³⁾

Διαμαρτυρεσθαι is used to translate: (a) קָדַם meaning to teach,⁽⁴⁾ (b) קָדַם meaning to show,⁽⁵⁾ (c) קָדַם (Hiph) meaning to enjoin solemnly or teach⁽⁶⁾ and (d) קָדַם (Hophal) meaning to be declared, shewn.⁽⁷⁾

Ἐπιμαρτυρεσθαι is used to translate קָדַם meaning to testify.⁽⁸⁾

Μαρτυρεσθαι is used meaning (a) to bear witness⁽⁹⁾ and (b) to call to witness.⁽¹⁰⁾

Ἀπομαρτυρεῖν is used meaning to testify.⁽¹¹⁾

(1) e.g. III K. 20.13.

(2) e.g. Job 15.6.

(3) e.g. Dan. 6.25.

(4) Ex. 18.20.

(5) e.g. Ezek. 16.2.

(6) e.g. IV. K. 17.15.

(7) e.g. Ex. 21.29.

(8) e.g. Am. 3.13.

(9) I Macc. 2.56.

(10) Judith 7.28.

(11) II Macc. 12.30.

CHAPTER IITHE CONCEPT OF TESTIMONY IN THE LXXGENERAL USAGE

Before proceeding to a presentation of the complex of ideas associated with the use of the *μαρτυρ* word-group in the Old Testament a preliminary statement about the general usage may be in place. In the Septuagint, generally, with regard to legal testimony, the concept follows closely the pattern of non-Biblical Greek and, naturally, there are numerous references to this in different circumstances, as e.g. the case of a dangerous ox, adultery and business transactions.⁽¹⁾ The false witness, it is said, will not go unpunished;⁽²⁾ witnesses for the prosecution appear in the incident of Naboth's vineyard; testifying against a neighbour without cause is forbidden; there are men who accuse Daniel;⁽³⁾ Job's lips are said to testify against him; his illness testifies against him and he says that those who saw his way of life in his prosperous days bore witness to his righteousness;⁽⁴⁾ the minimum number of witnesses required in any case is two or three⁽⁵⁾ and the accusers are also the punishers.⁽⁶⁾ God is the witness who sees all men's thoughts and deeds and he also, therefore, punishes.⁽⁷⁾ There is an obligation to testify laid upon everyone who witnesses the sin of another.⁽⁸⁾

(1) Ex.21.29; Nu.5.13; Ru.4.9-11; Jer.39.10f.

(2) Prov.19.5,9.

(3) Dan.6.25 (καταμαρτυρεῖν).

(4) Job 15.6 (cf. Is.59.12); 16.8; 29.11. (Heb.).

(5) Nu.35.30; Dt.17.6; 19.15.

(6) Dt.17.7.

(7) Jer.36.23; Mic.1.2; Mal.3.5.

(8) Lev.5.1.

Bearing false witness is regarded as a heinous crime⁽¹⁾ and the punishment with which it regularly meets is that which the accused would have suffered if the falsehood had not been detected. The ninth of the Ten Commandments is: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour," and "if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his brother; then shall ye do unto him as he had thought to have done to his brother."⁽²⁾ Testifying as 'a solemn declaring of judgement' is found in several instances⁽³⁾ and as 'commanding' in one.⁽⁴⁾

Testimony is used in a number of passages as a kind of proof by reminder of an event or truth as when Abraham says to Abimelech: "These seven ewe lambs shalt thou take of my hand that they may be a witness unto me, that I have digged this well."⁽⁵⁾ Other examples are the heap of stones and the pillar that Jacob and Laban built,⁽⁶⁾ the altar which the tribes of Reuben and Gad built on the other side of Jordan,⁽⁷⁾ the plucking off of the shoe to confirm Ruth's redemption,⁽⁸⁾ Job's misfortune,⁽⁹⁾ the establishment of the righteous king's throne,⁽¹⁰⁾ the altar and the pillar in Egypt prophesied by Isaiah.⁽¹¹⁾

-
- (1) Prov. 25.18.
 - (2) Ex. 20.16; Dt. 5.20; Dt. 19.18f; Ps. 26.12; 34.11; Prov. 19.5,9.
 - (3) Gen. 43.3; I K. 8.9; III K. 2.42; Dt. 8.19.
 - (4) Ex. 19.23.
 - (5) Gen. 21.30.
 - (6) Gen. 31.52. (Heb).
 - (7) Josh. 22.27,34.
 - (8) Ru. 4.7.
 - (9) Job 10.17.
 - (10) Prov. 29.14 (ἐἰς μαγνέτιον).
 - (11) Is. 19.19-21. (Heb).

Joshua at one point says to the people: "Ye are witnesses to yourselves that ye have chosen you the LORD, to serve him." to which they reply: "We are witnesses."⁽¹⁾ But, not content with this, the leader goes on to set up a stone as a witness: "Behold this stone shall be a witness unto us; for it hath heard all the words of the LORD which he spake unto us; it shall therefore be a witness unto you, lest ye deny your God."⁽²⁾ Another example of this kind of testimony is found in Psalm 88.38 where the moon is described as a faithful witness in heaven, that is to say, a witness to God's steadfastness to his covenant with David.⁽³⁾ These examples show that the μαρτυρεῖν is not so much the eye-witness testimony of events as the reminder of truths and relationships inherent in the events. The μαρτυρεῖν is chosen for this purpose, to testify to a relationship which in itself is, in fact, invisible.⁽⁴⁾ When a man cannot provide a human or material witness to testify to the truth of his statements he invokes God or heaven as witness;⁽⁵⁾ among God-

(1) Josh.24.22. The AV nearly always translates בְּךָ by 'against you' when the context favours simply 'to you'. LXX renders $\epsilon\gamma\ \tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon$ but sometimes uses the simple dative or $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$ with the gen. for which see LS.p. 883a, id. verb. II.7. which gives the meaning of $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$ as 'in respect of'.

(2) Josh.24.26f. Noth, p. 109 takes בְּךָ = 'against' without any reason given; cf. Keil and Delitzsch, pp.233f.

(3) Cf. Jer.33.20f. (Heb).

(4) The tabernacle of testimony was the place which reminded Israel of her relationship to God; here offerings were brought $\mu\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\ \kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota$ (Nu 31.54).

(5) I K.12.5; 20.23,42; Job 16.19.

fearing people this was in some ways more impressive than the production of earthly evidence for the invoker thereby submitted himself to what was for him the very real judgement of God. It also happens that God and heaven are invoked as witnesses for the confirmation of prophecy⁽¹⁾ or a promise.⁽²⁾

From these texts it is clear that the witness is the thing or person who reminds others of facts or truths and depends for authority upon confirmation by others and ultimately by God.⁽³⁾ False witness is detested and is punishable by the 'lex talionis'. Linked with the legal usage is the use of the word to express the idea of solemn affirmation, the implication being that the witness is calling God as co-witness, that is to say, he claims God as the authority for his statements since God is the all-seeing, all-knowing One; he claims the authority of the man who speaks the truth, an authority which must ultimately rest on faith in the hearer.

The *μάρτυς* or *μαρτύριον*, regarded as a kind of proof by reminder, has reference to a covenant relationship which may be forgotten or wilfully broken; it depends for authority on the faithfulness of both parties and has no obvious meaning and authority except for those who discern the fact or truth which it represents; and, further, it has no authority for those who are aware of its meaning and significance but are unfaithful to it. The important thing to note is that the lamb or the heap of stones, the altar or the pillar have no authority except insofar as they recall events which have occurred or words which have been spoken; but on the other hand, the survival of the witness and/or his testimony is essential for the survival of the truth which they 'carry'.

(1) Dt. 4.26; 30.19; 31.28

(2) Jer. 49.5. The LORD is here described as *ἐὶς μάρτυρα δίκαιον καὶ πιστόν*.

(3) Cf. H. Diem: *Ev. Theol.* 1(1934-35), pp. 424-6.

(2) THE PENTATEUCHThe Nature of the Testimony

In view of the above it is not surprising that the word-group is closely associated with the concept of the Torah⁽¹⁾ in the Old Testament, so closely, in fact, that torah and testimony are in numerous instances set in juxtaposition in the manner of Hebrew parallelism as in Deut. 4.44f: "Οὕτως ὁ νόμος . . . ταῦτα τὰ μαθήματα ." ⁽²⁾ The word תּוֹרָה is derived from the root תִּרְי (Hiph) meaning to teach, to instruct⁽³⁾ and so it would appear that the testimony must be associated with teaching in this context.⁽⁴⁾ This important fact emerges again in Ex. 18.20 where Jethro says to Moses: "And thou shalt teach them (תַּלְמִידֵיךָ, διαμαρτυρεῖν) ordinances and laws and shalt shew them the way wherein they must walk and the work (τὰ ἔργα) that they must do."⁽⁵⁾ The torah or testimony is the teaching⁽⁶⁾ which Moses received from God on Mount Sinai and which was written on two tables of stone, written with the finger of God, written on both sides, the work of God.⁽⁷⁾

(1) For torah = instruction see G. Östborn: Torah in the Old Testament: pp. 1-22 and esp. his reference to the parallel between תּוֹרָה and the S. Arabic verb meaning 'to show', and the consequent meaning of תּוֹרָה = 'indication' which would become identical with 'what one lets someone see'. (pp. 14f).

(2) Cf. Dt. 6.17, 20. "v. 45 is itself tautologous by the side of v. 44." Driver, ICC p. 80.

(3) Gesenius, p. CCCLXVI. col 2.

(4) R. Asting's definition of תּוֹרָה (Die Verkündigung, pp. 460-75): "einem Willen Ausdruck geben" is much too narrow.

(5) Cf. Ex. 19.10 where LXX inserts διαμαρτυρεῖται τῷ λαῷ; Dt. 4.1; Ps. 118.125.

(6) תּוֹרָה = doctrine, knowledge, which one receives (Dt. 32.1f: ἀποφθεγμὰ).

(7) Ex. 32.15f, 31.18; cf. G. Östborn, op. cit., p. 39.

The testimonies are also equated with the covenant which God commanded Israel to perform⁽¹⁾ and which Israel had sworn to keep,⁽²⁾ and with wisdom.⁽³⁾ Moses instructs the Levites: "Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the LORD your God, that it may be there for a witness to you"⁽⁴⁾ and from this point the tabernacle of testimony,⁽⁵⁾ the ark of testimony⁽⁶⁾ which it housed and the tables of testimony⁽⁷⁾ which were kept in the ark were held in absolute veneration. Indeed the Dead Sea Scrolls furnish evidence that, when they were written, the Tabernacle could be taken to mean the Torah (CD, 7.15: "The Books of the Law are the Tabernacle" (in Amos 9.11); cf. 4Q Florilegium: "The Scripture says: 'I will raise up the Tabernacle of David that is fallen down.' That Tabernacle denotes The Law". Very often the Biblical writers used the single word $\pi\alpha\rho\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta$ to denote the ark of testimony.⁽⁸⁾ The writer of Deuteronomy presents another form of the testimony in the Song of Moses (Deut.

(1) Dt. 4.13, 45; 29.1-3.

(2) Ex. 19.8; 24.3, 7; Dt. 5.27; 26.17; cf. W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 70.

(3) Cf. G.F. Moore: Judaism, pp. 263-70 for the identifying of torah and wisdom in the OT and Rabbinic Judaism.

(4) Dt. 31.26. The AV has 'a witness against thee' but ע can mean 'in' or 'among'; cf. Lam. 1.3; IV K.18.5, Ps. 118.7; Gesenius, XCVII. col. 1(2).

(5) Ex. 28.43; 29.10f. etc; Lev. 1.5 etc; Nu. 1.1 etc; 1.53, 9.15 ($\sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$), Dt. 31.14f.

(6) Ex. 25.22; 26.33f; 30.6, 26; 31.7; 39.21; 40.3, 5, 21; Nu. 4.5; 7.89; cf. Ps. 121.4.

(7) Ex. 31.18; 32.15; (34.28: $\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \delta\iota\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\kappa\eta\varsigma$).

(8) Ex. 16.34; 25.16, 21; 27.21; 30.6, 36; 40.20; Lev. 16.13; Nu. 17.4.

32.1-43) which God commands him to write and to teach⁽¹⁾ the children of Israel, "that this song may witness for me to the children of Israel"⁽²⁾and it shall come to pass..... that this song shall testify to them as a witness for it shall not be forgotten out of the mouths of their seed."⁽³⁾ It appears, then that in the Pentateuch, the testimony is the basic teaching about God which Moses received on Sinai⁽⁴⁾ but although historical events are associated with the testimony there can be here no question of a simple eye-witness of fact for Moses says to Israel: "Ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spoke unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire."⁽⁵⁾

(1) Rengstorff, KWB. II. 139f. interprets διδάσκειν as pertaining generally to the will of God and denies that it is ever used for the prophetic proclamation of the coming salvation but this can be maintained only by an artificial separation of προφητεύειν διδάσκειν and the μάγος -group which is not found in 'Moses and the prophets and the psalms'. The μαρτύριον which is the content of the prophetic teaching includes the story of past salvation-acts and the promise of new ones. When Jehoshaphat sent the leaders, Levites and priests to teach out of the book (!) of the law the teaching would undoubtedly include the story of the Exodus and all the promises.

(2) E. König, Das Deuteronomium, p. 84: "Das Lied sollte den Israeliten das voraussehende Wissen der Gottheit (21 ab) dokumentieren, nicht bezeugen, dass, 'Israel nicht ungewarnt bleibt.'"

(3) Dt. 31.19-21; v. 19: εἰς μαρτύριον ἐν ὄρεϊ, Ἰσραὴλ....

(Heb. 77); v. 21: καὶ ἀντικατεστήσεται ἡ ῥῶν αὐτῆ κατὰ πρόσωπον μαρτυροῦσα (Heb. 77). The song or torah is to be put in the ark of the covenant εἰς μαρτύριον (Dt. 31.26).

(4) E. König: "Die Zeugnisse sind die unmittelbaren Kundgebungen der prophetischen Erkenntnis, also zunächst Aussagen, in denen Momente der äusserlichen Offenbarungsgeschichte bezeugt werden, wie wenn z.b. von der Erscheinung Gottes am Horeb gesprochen wird (5.4 usw)."

(5) Dt. 4.15. Driver (Deuteronomy, pp. 80f; 341f; and 382) sees God's law as 'a testimony against human sin' but the torah is essentially and primarily a statement of God's will and a reminder of God's nature rather than a condemnation of man's disobedience. Cunliffe-Jones: (Deuteronomy) takes the same line, (p.171) yet sets in surprising juxtaposition the two thoughts: "The law is a witness against human sin" and "IT IS YOUR LIFE".

A study of the Content of this Testimony reveals that it is much more than 'law' in the modern sense;⁽¹⁾ it may be classified under four⁽²⁾ main headings: (a) The Nature and Sovereignty of God; (b) The Moral Law; (c) The Redemptive Activity of God⁽³⁾ and (d) The Promise of Future Blessedness or Doom.⁽⁴⁾ This comes out clearly in passages like the Song of Moses: (a) God is the Most High who has no equal (Deut. 32.8, 39); (b) all his ways are judgement (32.4); (c) God is the Saviour (32.15) who purchased Israel (32.6); (d) God promises future doom to those who will not turn to him (32.20-26, 41f) and blessedness to those who do (32.36, 39, 43), and also in Deuteronomy chapters 4 and 6. Anyone who even touches the mountain from which God speaks shall surely be put to death⁽⁵⁾ for "the LORD thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous God;"⁽⁶⁾

(1) "Law or Nomos is not a correct rendering of the Hebrew word Torah. The legalistic element, which might rightly be called the Law, represents only one side of the Torah. To the Jew the word Torah means a teaching or an instruction of any kind." Schechter: Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. (1909). p.117; cf. K. Kohler: The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church, p.142; G.F. Moore: Judaism. I. pp.248, 263; P. Carrington: The Primitive Christian Catechism. p.3; B. Gerhardsson: Memory and Manuscript. p. 21.

(2) Oepke, KWB. III. 574. 18-20. finds three aspects of Revelation: "Diese Offenbarung vollzieht sich vor allem nach drei Richtungen hin: Jahweh offenbart sich als Herr der Geschichte, als der Heilige und Gnädige, als Schöpfer der Welt." - but there are really four, as becomes clear on p.575. 15-47; cf. O. Michel: Ev. Theol. 2(1935). pp. 233f.

(3) P. Althaus: The So-called Kerygma. is wrong in stating (p. 30) that in the case of the word of God proclaimed in the prophets the moment (factor?) of witness is not to historical events and that the factor of legitimation is a different one in the case of the apostles from that in the case of the prophets, precisely because of the relation to past history. The prophets also testified to past historical events, e.g. the Exodus.

(4) Cf. K. Barth: (Theol. Exist. Heute. 12(1934). p.5) defines Testimony as a "human word given authority by God to remind others of the Sovereignty, Grace and Righteousness of God."

(5) Ex. 19.12.

(6) Dt. 4.24.

He is the creator,⁽¹⁾ the God of truth⁽²⁾ with whom no god can compare.⁽³⁾ The moral law of God is summed up in the Decalogue,⁽⁴⁾ the rules for the behaviour of God's people.⁽⁵⁾ Obedience to the law brings life⁽⁶⁾ and success⁽⁷⁾ but disobedience brings doom.⁽⁸⁾ It is insisted, however, that Israel's preservation and the success of God's people are due ultimately not to their obedience to the law but to God's mercy: "Understand therefore, that the LORD thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness."⁽⁹⁾ The redeeming action of God on behalf of his people is fully expressed in the story of the deliverance from Egypt. At the burning bush God tells Moses: "I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians."⁽¹⁰⁾ He introduces the giving of the Ten Commandments with these words: "I am the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt."⁽¹¹⁾ Moses, in his instruction about the testimonies (τὰ μαρτύρια) says to Israel: "The LORD brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand; and the LORD showed signs and wonders, great and sore upon Egypt....."⁽¹²⁾

(1) Dt. 32.6, 18.

(2) Dt. 32.4.

(3) Dt. 3.24; Dt. 32.39; Ex. 20.2.

(4) Ex. 20.1-17; cf. Dt. 5.1-21.

(5) Ex. 18.20; 19.5; Dt. 4.2 40; 6.24, 7.11.

(6) Dt. 30.5ff.; cf. 6.24.

(7) Dt. 11.13f.

(8) Dt. 30.17f.

(9) Dt. 9.4; cf. 8.18.

(10) Ex. 3.8.

(11) Ex. 20.2; cf. 19.4; Dt. 4.10, 37.

(12) Dt. 6.20-22; cf. 7.18f; 9.26; 11.2-4, 7; 26.8; 7.8; 32.6.

Any prophet or seer who detracts from this story of redemption should not be listened to but should be put to death⁽¹⁾ for he is really a false witness. God's love does not stop at setting Israel free but continues throughout the desert wanderings where God bears Israel as a man doth bear his son.⁽²⁾ The fourth aspect of the teaching is the Promise of God which may be of blessedness or of damnation. Israel is promised: "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure to me above all people. for all the earth is mine."⁽³⁾ God brought them out that he might bring them in⁽⁴⁾ and he will fight for them and destroy all their enemies and lead them into Canaan;⁽⁵⁾ but always there is the element of judgement as when Moses tells the people: "I call heaven and earth to witness to you this day that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life."⁽⁶⁾

The aim of the testimony is to show God's power and to declare his name; God tells Pharaoh through Moses: "For this cause have I raised thee up, for to show in thee my power and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth."⁽⁷⁾ At the Feast of the Tabernacles the law is to be read before all Israel in their hearing...that they may learn and fear the LORD.⁽⁸⁾

-
- (1) Dt.13.5f.
 - (2) Dt.1.31.
 - (3) Ex.19.5.
 - (4) Dt.6.23.
 - (5) Dt.4.22; cf.31.3.
 - (6) Dt.30.19.
 - (7) Ex.9.16.
 - (8) Dt.31.11f.

The Authority of the Witness

Moses⁽¹⁾ is the first and most important witness in this technical sense of one who teaches and calls to mind the torah or testimony. He it is who gathers together the testimony and impresses it upon Israel by having it inscribed upon the tablets of stone and kept and cherished in the ark within the tabernacle, and by writing the Song which was to be taught to the generations. His authority depends upon the fact that he has been sent (ἀποστείλω σε) by God⁽²⁾ taught by God what to say⁽³⁾ and that he speaks in God's name.⁽⁴⁾ God speaks in dreams and visions to other prophets but face to face with his servant Moses who is faithful⁽⁵⁾ and so, because God's words are in his mouth⁽⁶⁾ he stands between the LORD and Israel to show the word of God.⁽⁷⁾ Moses' authority is said to be attested by signs and wonders which the LORD sent him to do⁽⁸⁾ but these are really indications of the power of the LORD, for Moses' authority is the delegated, spiritual authority of the prophet⁽⁹⁾ who has no exclusive prerogative to office, since this may be fulfilled by non-official as well as by official prophets, as is shown in the story of Eldad and Medad who did not receive the spirit that was upon Moses but who, nevertheless, prophesied in the camp.

(1) Cf. Rengstorff: KWB. IV. 431.47f: "Die Religion Israels steht und fällt mit Mose und seinem werk."

(2) Ex. 3.10-15.

(3) Ex. 4.12.

(4) Ex. 5.23.

(5) Nu. 12.6-8; cf. Dt. 34.10.

(6) Dt. 18.18.

(7) Dt. 5.5, 22, 27.

(8) Dt. 34.11f.

(9) Dt. 34.10; Hos. 12.14. "In Judaism the Holy Spirit is specifically the spirit of prophecy (Moore: Judaism. I. pp. 237, 421).

When Joshua urged Moses to forbid them, the leader's reply was: "Would God that all the LORD's people were prophets and that the LORD would put his spirit upon them."⁽¹⁾ Moses' authority could be challenged by Miriam and Aaron:⁽²⁾ "Hath the LORD indeed spoken only by Moses? Hath he not also spoken by us?" and God's reply is that Moses is different from all other prophets in that God speaks with him mouth to mouth and he shall behold the similitude of the LORD.⁽³⁾ At another time Moses and Aaron are opposed by Korah, Dathan and Abiram along with two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly who say: "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the LORD is among them: wherefore then lift ye yourselves above the congregation of the LORD?"⁽⁴⁾ The authority of Moses and Aaron is vindicated by the miracle of the earthquake, i.e. by God. It is significant that Moses' authority is not the kind that can be transferred by his laying hands on his successor; the seventy elders have the spirit put upon them by God and when the spirit rested upon

(1) Nu.11.16f., 25-29. Cullmann (The Early Church, pp.93f.) is correct in his insistence that in the OT there is no infallible teaching-office. Cf. Mk.9.38ff.; par.

(2) Nu.12.2.

(3) This last is contradicted by the account in Ex.24.9-11 where it is said that the seventy elders saw God and did eat and drink, and also by Ex.33.18-23 where Moses asks to see the glory of God and God replies: "I will make all my goodness pass before you.....thou canst not see my face.....thou shalt see my back parts; but my face shall not be seen." It is significant the LXX translates ὁπαρ = 'appearance', 'image' by εἰδωλόν (cf. Jn.1.14).

(4) Nu.16.1-35. The stories of Korah and the others are intertwined but the main point is that there was a rebellion against an allegedly self-assumed priestly prerogative.

them they prophesied⁽¹⁾ and, further, it is the LORD who sets a man over (ἐπισκοπεῖν) the congregation as his successor,⁽²⁾ telling him to take Joshua, a man in whom the spirit already is! and to commission him in the sight of the congregation.⁽³⁾ It is clear that Moses' authority insofar as he is a religious rather than a military or administrative leader is a teaching authority based ultimately upon the testimony with which he has been entrusted by God.⁽⁴⁾

When the Authority of the Message itself is investigated it is plain that the main aspects of it do not alter and it is always regarded as being a gift of God; it is taught by God;⁽⁵⁾ it is commanded by God⁽⁶⁾ and the two tables are the work (ἔργον) of God written by the finger of God;⁽⁷⁾ the words of the covenant are a revelation vouchsafed to Israel by God;⁽⁸⁾ the testimony is God's words and the wisdom of Israel.⁽⁹⁾

(1) Nu.11.16-25.

(2) διὰδοχος Μωυσῆ ἐν προφητείας (Sir.46.1).

(3) Nu.27.15-23. In Dt.34.9: וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אֶת-יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן-נוּן עַל-יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן-נוּן לֵאמֹר וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אֶת-יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן-נוּן עַל-יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן-נוּן לֵאמֹר LXX:

Ἐπέθηκεν γὰρ Μωυσῆς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτόν.

There would appear to be a reference to an authority conferred by laying on of hands; (cf. D. Daube (JTS. XXXIX. p. 47) who refers to "Siphre on Num.27.18ff. where the Midrash remarks that Joshua was thereby permitted to deliver teachings and judgements even while Moses was yet alive.") but a good case can be made for taking וַיִּתֵּן as a relative pronoun (Gesenius, CCCXC.col.2) or even as a relative conjunction, meaning 'so that' (Gesenius, CCCXCI. IB.(2)). Dix (The Apostolic Ministry, p. 233) insists that the Spirit comes on Joshua and the elders by the laying on of hands in spite of Nu.27.18 and 11.7 where there is no mention of this action.

(4) Cf. Rengstorff (KWB. IV. p. 432.16f): "Es (der rückwärts gewandte Blick der Propheten) geht um die Sache, nicht um den Mann."

(5) Ex.4.12,15: Dt.4.1.

(6) Ex.7.2; Dt.1.3; 4.2,14.

(7) Ex.32.16.

(8) Dt.29.28.

(9) Dt.4.5f.

The testimony was accorded supreme honour; it was not to be tampered with or departed from⁽¹⁾ but always to be kept.⁽²⁾ The king at his ordination was to be given a copy of the torah to uphold it.⁽³⁾ The veneration in which the tabernacle was held, the way in which all the religious life and service (λειτουργία) centred round it shows the measure of the authority of the testimony contained in it. It is the place where God promises to meet Israel and commune with them and speak to them, and where his glory will be seen and where he will dwell with his people.⁽⁴⁾ For safety it was put in the charge of the Levites and elders,⁽⁵⁾ so priests and Levites are necessary for order and for the preservation of the testimony; but they must be steadfast to the latter.⁽⁶⁾

The Transmission of the Testimony

Unless the teaching is handed down from one generation to another it is in danger of being forgotten or lost (something which actually took place once in Israel's history some time prior to the reign of Josiah⁽⁷⁾ and this transmission of the faith is reckoned as continuous from the time of Abraham the father of faith of whom the LORD says (Gen. 18.19): "For I know that he will order (συντάξει) his sons and his house after him and they will keep the ways of the Lord (φυλάξουσιν τὰς ὁδοὺς Κυρίου) to do justice and judgment. Moses was diligent in

(1) Dt. 4.2; 5.32.

(2) Dt. 11.1.

(3) Dt. 17.18 ff; II Chron. 34.31; cf. IV. K. 11.12: "And he brought forth the king's son and gave him... the testimony."

(4) Ex. 25.22, 29.42-46 (cf. Jn. 1.14); 30.6, 36, Nu. 17.19; Lev. 16.2; cf. III K. 8.10-12.

(5) Nu. 1.50-53.

(6) Lev. 10.11. Gerhardsson gives full references for the original role of the priests and Levites as bearers and preservers of the torah (Memory and Manuscript p.86, n.5)

(7) IV. K. 22.8-23.3.

teaching his contemporaries and in insisting that they in turn should continue the process.⁽¹⁾ The testimonies are to be taught to succeeding generations;⁽²⁾ they are to be bound on the hand and between the eyes, written on doorposts and gates⁽³⁾ and diligently kept;⁽⁴⁾ they are not to be added to⁽⁵⁾ and all false prophets are to be rejected.⁽⁶⁾ Moses faithfully wrote the torah and handed it on to the priests and elders⁽⁷⁾ and taught his Song to Israel, giving instructions that it should be handed down.⁽⁸⁾ In all this several things are evident, viz. The idea of testimony is bound up with the teaching of the fundamental truths about God in his relationships with men. It is the evidence and reminder of the covenant between God and his people Israel, which he made for his own glory. The witness is the one who is chosen, called and sent by God to present the testimony that the people of God may be reminded of God's doctrine and then in turn show forth his glory that the whole world may at last glorify God. The all-important factor is the teaching itself, and the teachers or witnesses have no authority except by virtue of the commission which they have from God and their loyalty to the basic, essential message which is the *raison d'être* of their commission. This testimony is taught originally by God, that is to say, it is a revelation, given by the spirit of God; the authority of the witness is not hereditary nor is it transmitted by the laying on of hands; the truth alone, not the teaching or leading office, can be transmitted as authoritative.

(1) Dt. 5.31; 6.1.

(2) Dt. 4.9f; 6.7; 11.19; 29.28.

(3) Dt. 6.8f; 11.18-20.

(4) Dt. 6.17.

(5) Dt. 5.22.

(6) Dt. 13.1-5.

(7) Dt. 31.9; cf. 24.8.

(8) Dt. 31.19, 22.

Conclusion

The authority of the testimony has no external sanction and depends on 'seeing' or not 'seeing', on 'hearing' or not 'hearing', on obeying and serving or on rebelling and apostatising. Moses and Israel at the time of the Exodus and in subsequent events witnessed the mighty acts of God⁽¹⁾ but these are simply signs of the activity of God which depend for their acceptance as such upon an answering faith in the beholder; they saw no similitude of the king of the universe on his throne or of the LORD of history controlling events; they heard no actual voice giving commands or uttering promises. They were aware of their release from slavery; they saw the flames and smoke of Sinai; they heard the rumbling of the volcano; they heard the voice of Moses; they saw the two tables of stone; and in and through all this God revealed himself to them and they believed, more or less. The authority of Moses, the prophetic authority, the authority of the witness of God is that of the man who sees an event and interprets it spiritually or who hears a statement and, recognising it to be the truth, is constrained to repeat it;⁽²⁾ but this authority of the witness is recognised only by those who make a similar interpretation or recognise the same truth and are constant to it.

(1) Ex. 3.3; 6.1; 14.13; 16.7 etc.

(2) Cf. C.H. Dodd: History and the Gospel. p. 30: "The message of the OT prophets does not unfold secrets of another world but interprets the events of this."

(3) THE EIGHTH CENTURY PROPHETSThe Nature of the Testimony

The first occurrence of a member of the μαρτυρ group in the eighth century prophets is in Is. 8.2 where Urias and Zacharias are to be witnesses of the written prophecy of Isaiah. In view of v. 16 where Aquila retains the meaning of the Hebrew: "Bind up the μαρτύριον, seal the torah among my disciples" μαρτυρ should be taken in the sense of 'disciple'. In 8.20 the law and the testimony which give light⁽¹⁾ are recommended by the prophet as the best source of advice when the people of God are in trouble.⁽²⁾ Aquila's translation of Is. 30.8 gives εἰς μαρτύριον for עֵינֵינוּ-לָנוּ and is quite acceptable in view of vv. 9-11 and 8.2, 16, 20.

In Amos 3.13 the prophet calls on the priests to testify (ἐπιμαρτύρασθε) to the house of Jacob. This is the command of God, (ὁ παντοκράτωρ)⁽³⁾ who demands that men should live justly,⁽⁴⁾ who brought Israel out of Egypt⁽⁵⁾ and who will punish those who sin against him⁽⁶⁾ but who promises blessedness to those who earnestly seek him.⁽⁷⁾

In the prophecies of Isaiah 1-39, Amos, Hosea and Micah the testimony is called by different names. Isaiah's testimony is called a vision⁽⁸⁾ and in Hosea 10.11 God says: I have also spoken by the prophets and I have multiplied visions and used similitudes by the hand of the prophets;⁽⁹⁾

(1) Cf. Ps. 118.105; II Pet. 1.19.

(2) Is. 8.16, 20 should be read in the light of Sir. 33.3f. where συνέβησον παιδείαν is equivalent to ετοίμασον λόγον

(3) Am. 3.13; 4.13.

(4) Am. 4.1; 5.24 etc.

(5) Am. 9.7.

(6) Am. 3.14 etc.

(7) Am. 9.11-15.

(8) Is. 1.1.

(9) In Hos. 2.14 μαρτύριον is a mistranslation of נִסִּים and in 7.12 Symmachus has εἰς μαρτύριον for עֵינֵינוּ, an understandable error.

very frequently the law and the word are equated, as when Isaiah says: "Hear the word of the LORD, ye rulers of Sodom, give ear unto the law of our God⁽¹⁾ and law and testimony are equated with the word in Is. 8.20. Isaiah is said to 'see' the word⁽²⁾ but the torah or testimony is clearly a form of doctrine as is shown by 2.3; it is also described as the knowledge which God teaches,⁽³⁾ the Lord God's παιδεία (Am. 3.7) and the way which Micah promises will be taught in the future.⁽⁴⁾ In Micah 1.2 God is described as the witness who, through the prophet, will teach the truth which the false prophets are neglecting or distorting or suppressing.⁽⁵⁾ Testimony and torah are identified in Is. 8.16;⁽⁶⁾ the testimony in Amos 3.13 (ἐπιμαρτύρασθε)⁽⁷⁾ is the equivalent of prophesying, the subject being the counsel παιδεία of the LORD God revealed to his prophets who, having heard it, cannot but prophesy⁽⁸⁾. Finally, the torah is contrasted with the precepts of men (διδάσκοντες ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίας)⁽⁹⁾. It is clear from the above that

(1) Is. 1.10.
(2) Is. 2.1; (Heb) cf. Am. 1.1.

(3) Is. 28.9; cf. 11.9.

(4) Mi. 4.1f; cf. Is. 30.20f. Symmachus translates $\pi\eta\gamma\eta\zeta\ \nu\epsilon\mu\omega\zeta$ by (παιδεύσω αὐτοὺς) κατὰ ἀκοῆς τῆς μαρτυρίας (αὐτῶν), thus linking teaching and testimony. For torah as 'way' see Östborn: Torah in the Old Testament, p. 111.

(5) Mi. 2.11; 3.5-7, 11.

(6) "Probably the nature of the instruction.....was in the main consonant with that general annunciation proclaimed by the prophets to the people at large" (Östborn, p. 133).

(7) Plural because it is a reference to the prophets: against W.R. Harper: Amos and Hosea, p. 82 and A. Weiser: Die Prophetie des Amos, pp. 148ff. LXX: διότι (v 14) = 'because'.

(8) Am. 3.7f; cf. I Cor. 9.16. The content of this testimony is not necessarily limited to the doom in vv. 14f. since $\pi\eta$ can very well mean 'because'.

(9) Is. 29.13; cf. Mt. 15.9.

Mowinckel's contention that "Der heilige Geist der Propheten war nach jüdischer Ansicht vor allem ein Strafprediger und ein Überführer von Sünden gewesen."⁽¹⁾ is far too restricted.

The Four-fold Content of the Testimony⁽²⁾ is seen most clearly and concisely in the prophecy of Micah. (a) God is the LORD of the whole earth;⁽³⁾ (b) he pronounces doom on those who devise iniquity and he has shown man what is good;⁽⁴⁾ (c) God is he who brought Israel up out of Egypt and redeemed them out of the house of servants;⁽⁵⁾ (d) he promises that he will gather the remnant of Israel, that the house of the LORD will be established and that peace will prevail over all.⁽⁶⁾ Other references are found to God's sovereignty and reality⁽⁷⁾ his moral law⁽⁸⁾ his redemptive activity⁽⁹⁾ and his promises.⁽¹⁰⁾

The Authority of these early preachers of the word of God was not necessarily official, as Amos demonstrates: "I was a herdsman...and the LORD took me;"⁽¹¹⁾ it was a charismatic ministry according to Micah who cries: "Let the LORD be witness (Εἰς μαρτύριον) to you, the LORD from his holy temple"⁽¹²⁾ and

(1) ZNW, 32 (1933). 2/3. p.117.

(2) Rendtorff; KWB. VI. 810.39-811.39) gives a very sketchy description of the content of the prophetic message which he sees as a promise or threat, a reproach for neglect of God's law (in Amos and Micah), for honouring other gods (in Hos. Jer. and Ezek), for false trust in other powers (in Isaiah) and for seeing security in the cultus (in most of them). He makes no mention of testifying to God's mighty redemptive acts.

(3) Mi.4.13; 1.4.

(4) Mi.2.1; 3.1-3; 6.8.

(5) Mi.6.4; cf. 7.15.

(6) Mi.2.12; 4.1-3.

(7) Is.1.2; 2.8,10; 6.3; 17.7; 26.13; Ho.4.17; 8.14; Am.5.8.

(8) Is.1.12; 5.20ff; 30.9; Ho.4.1,6; 5.5; 8.1,12; Am.2.4; 5.14.

(9) Is.5.1-4; 10.24-26; 29.22; Ho.11.1; 13.4; Am.2.10; 3.1.

(10) Is.2.3; 11.9,11-16; 12.2-4; 19.19; 28.16; 29.18,24;

Ho.2.17 ff; 4.9; 5.15; 13.14; Am.9.13 ff; Mi.4.8,10; 7.15.

(11) Am.7.15f.

(12) Mi.1.2.

later he explains: "Truly I am full of power by the spirit of the LORD, and of judgement, and of might to declare unto Jacob his transgression."⁽¹⁾ Isaiah states that he has declared what he has heard from the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel.⁽²⁾ The prophet is sent (ἀποστέλλω) by God,⁽³⁾ that is to say, he is authorised by God. Within himself he has a strong conviction of his calling which comes privately to him in a vision⁽⁴⁾ or is revealed in his ears by the LORD of hosts;⁽⁵⁾ at any rate, what he receives is a revelation of God's counsel (παῖδεία)⁽⁶⁾ and when this happens he must prophesy,⁽⁶⁾ testify.⁽⁷⁾ The spirit of the LORD will rest upon the Messiah foretold in Isaiah 11, the spirit of, among other things, the knowledge of the LORD which will eventually cover the earth.⁽⁸⁾ Certainly, the Messiah will have a teaching authority.

The Authority of the Testimony

The testimony which the prophet bears is his only external attestation and his authority rests upon this teaching which is opposed to the false teaching of the prophet's own day.⁽⁹⁾ The only true oracle is the law and the testimony which has the authority of God himself and if the prophetic word is not according to it the people will walk in darkness.⁽¹⁰⁾ Priests and prophets are false witnesses when they depart from the torah⁽¹¹⁾ and their vision is like a sealed book.⁽¹²⁾ The authority of

-
- (1) Mi. 3.8.
 - (2) Is. 21.10.
 - (3) Is. 6.8f; 8.11 etc.
 - (4) e.g. Is. 6.1ff.
 - (5) Is. 22.14.
 - (6) Am. 3.8.
 - (7) Am. 3.13.
 - (8) Cf. Is. 32.3f.
 - (9) Is. 8.11; 9.15; 28.7; 29.10 ff, 24; Mi 3.5.
 - (10) Is. 8.19.-23.
 - (11) Is. 28.7.
 - (12) Is. 29.11; Ho. 4.6; Am. 2.4; Mi. 3.5.

the prophet's message is that of the truth and goodness; it is revealed by God (Am. 3) and, having no external sanction, it depends for its acceptance on the vision or insight and obedience of faith.⁽¹⁾ Anyone may reject it as not binding on himself and Israel has done this repeatedly; the priests teach for hire and the prophets divine for money and do not lean upon the LORD.⁽²⁾

The Transmission of the Testimony

The authentic prophets are as concerned as Moses that the testimony should be preserved and handed on from generation to generation of the faithful. Hosea states that if the fathers forget the torah God forgets the children.⁽³⁾ Isaiah taught the people knowledge, "Precept upon precept, line upon line; here a little and there a little" (Heb) and he looks forward longingly to the day when "they also that erred in spirit shall come to understanding, and they that murmured shall learn doctrine"⁽⁴⁾and the father to the children shall make known thy truth."⁽⁵⁾ The concern of God's prophets is not simply that the law is disobeyed but that it is distorted in the teaching of the false prophets who teach lies and cause

(1) As C.H. Dodd puts it: "Prophets say that they saw that Jehovah the Holy One is a God of righteousness, that they heard him say that he desires mercy.....the idea came to them...they were convinced not because of the imaginative form in which the idea came but because of its inherent truth and worthiness". (The Authority of the Bible, pp. 95f.); cf. T.W. Manson: Martyrs and Martyrdom, p. 468: "These unauthorised prophets with a message which does not come from the Council of Yahweh might fairly be called 'false witnesses of God'."

(2) Is. 5.24; 30.9; Ho. 4.6; Am. 2.4; Mi. 3.11.

(3) Ho. 4.6.

(4) Is. 29.24; cf. 30.20f.

(5) Is. 38.19.

the people to err⁽¹⁾ "by the precept of men."⁽²⁾ These false teachers are also said to err in spirit,⁽³⁾ which confirms the conclusion that the testimony is a charisma from God who opens and closes the eyes and ears of men.⁽⁴⁾

Conclusion

The testimony of the eighth century prophets is the original testimony or torah of Moses. The people have forgotten or despised this and the false prophets have degraded it so the true prophets are summoned by God to remind Israel of the covenant and to recall them to it. The word is given to the prophet privately in a vision or in his ear and his authority which is not hereditary or official or transmissible rests on the message, the law or testimony, from which alone God's people should seek guidance. Again, the content of the testimony retains the same fourfold character as was shown in the Pentateuch. Reference is made to the handing down of the message by the teacher to his disciples. The authority of the message is that of the truth which, having no external sanction, depends for its acceptance on the insight and obedience of faith. In these prophetic books there emerges the picture of the witness as the divinely-inspired teacher or preacher, commissioned by God to recall his people to the covenant by testifying, that is by placing before his hearers the events and truths of the original testimony. The prophet has no authority in the sense that he is an eye-witness of historical events; the testimony of even Moses and his generation came by faith and insight and obedience; other nations witnessed the events but did not put the same construction upon them or submit to

(1) Is.9.15; cf. Am.2.4; Mi.2.11.

(2) Is.29.13.

(3) Is.29.24.

(4) Is.6.9f; 29.10; Am.3.7.

the demands which follow upon such a construction. The content of the testimony, however, - this historical vessel with its spiritual treasure - serves for following generations as a touchstone of truth. The prophets or apostles, for so they may be called, are men who repeat the history of the people of God and interpret it for their own time as Moses did for his.

4. THE HISTORICAL BOOKS

The Nature of the Testimony

The history of Israel is the history of God's dealings with that nation. This is constantly kept before their eyes in the preaching of the prophets whom God sends from time to time to remind them of the covenant.⁽¹⁾ The LORD reveals himself to the prophet in visions by the word of the LORD⁽²⁾ and the prophet then teaches the people the good and right way.⁽³⁾ The law commanded by Joshua is the law commanded by Moses, the servant of God; Solomon is enjoined by David: "Keep the charge of the LORD thy God, to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes and his commandments and his judgements and his testimonies, as it is written in the torah of Moses."⁽⁴⁾ The ark of the testimony is identified with the ark of the covenant⁽⁵⁾ and Josiah, when the book of the law is discovered, makes a covenant "to keep...his testimonies...to perform the words of this covenant."⁽⁶⁾ The ark of the testimony, which contained the two tables of stone is housed in the tabernacle of testimony that God's name might be there.⁽⁷⁾ God's name is equated with God's presence

(1) IV. K.17.13, etc. (cf. II Chron.24.19; II Esd.19.30) To remind rather than to warn (with W. Rudolph: Chronikbücher, p.276: "Jahwe....sandte seine Propheten als Mahner und Warner.")). K. Gallings: Die Bücher der Chronik, pp.237f, 251, 253 continues the tradition of translating the word-group in terms of warning.

(2) I K.3.1, 21.

(3) I K.12.23; cf. III K.8.36.

(4) III K.2.3; cf. II Chron.23.11.

(5) Josh.4.16,18; cf. III K.8.21.

(6) IV. K.23.3; cf. II Chron.34.31.

(7) III K.8.9,16-21,29; cf. II Chron.7.16,20.

in II Chron. where Jehoshaphat says in his prayer: "When we stand before this house, and in thy presence, (for thy name is in this house)".⁽¹⁾ When Israel broke the Sabbath, Nehemiah testified (ἐπιμαρτύρομαι) to them, which probably means that he read to them out of the book of Moses and applied the teaching to their behaviour.⁽²⁾ Testimony and teaching are equated by the authors of I and IV Kings.⁽³⁾

The Content of the Testimony

There are three passages in the historical books where the four aspects of the testimony are seen clearly. The last words of Joshua follow closely the pattern of the testifying of Moses in the Pentateuch although the actual term is not employed. (a) He exalts the LORD above all the gods;⁽⁴⁾ (b) he makes reference to the torah and the holiness of God who looks askance at transgression of his torah;⁽⁵⁾ (c) he reminds them of the mighty acts of redemption wrought at the Exodus and in the desert⁽⁶⁾ and (d) he brings to their notice the two-sided promise of God.⁽⁷⁾ In Chapter 24, however, the people, having accepted the covenant which is based on the testimony of Joshua and having vowed to serve the LORD (λατρεύειν : Heb. לָבַדּוּ),⁽⁸⁾ Joshua says to them: μαρτυρεῖς ὑμεῖς καθ' ὑμῶν ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐξελέξασθε κύριον, that is to say, they must keep on reminding themselves of the covenant and therefore also of the testimony.

(1) II Chron. 20.9.
 (2) NEsd. 23.15, 21; cf. 23.1, 3.
 (3) I K. 12.23; cf. 8.9; IV. K. 17.13; cf. v. 28 but Keil: The Books of the Kings, pp. 415f. translates: 'testified against'.
 (4) Josh. 23.7.16; 24.14f.
 (5) Josh. 23.6; 24.19.
 (6) Josh. 23.3f, 9.14, 24.3-13, 17f, 31.
 (7) Josh. 23.5, 10, 12f, 15.
 (8) לָבַדּוּ. The prefix need not necessarily mean 'against'; it could very well mean 'in respect of' (Gesenius XCVIII (10)).

Secondly, the writer of IV Kings avers that "The LORD testified (διεμαρτύρατο) to Israel and Judah by all the prophets... saying, "Turn ye.....and they rejected his statutes and his covenant which he made with their fathers, and his testimonies (τὰ μαρτύρια) which he testified (διεμαρτύρατο) to them".⁽¹⁾ Not only are the commandments of God included in this testimony but also the lordship⁽²⁾ of him who brought them up out of the land of Egypt with great power and a stretched-out arm⁽³⁾ and who promises to deliver them in the future if they will obey him.⁽⁴⁾

Thirdly, II Esdras gives an account of the reading of the torah to the people at the first Feast of Tabernacles after the return from the Exile: "The Levites caused the people to understand the torah...so they read in the book, in the law of God distinctly."⁽⁵⁾ The Levites then strike up a song of praise which incorporates the content of the testimony: the confession that God is the creator⁽⁶⁾ who made a covenant with Abraham to give him the land and brought Israel out of Egypt, shewing signs and wonders,⁽⁷⁾ who gave right judgements, and true laws by the hand of Moses and made promises;⁽⁸⁾ but in spite of the testifying of the prophets⁽⁹⁾ Israel will not turn to God and his law.

(1) IV. K. 17.13-15.

(2) IV. K. 17.35, 38f.

(3) IV. K. 17.36.

(4) IV K. 17.39. T.W. Manson's description of the content of this testimony as "a report to Israel about God's actions and intentions" (Martyrs and Martyrdom, p.467) is too narrow.

(5) II Esd. 18.7f.

(6) II Esd. 19.6.

(7) II Esd. 19.7-12, 15, 21-25, 28.

(8) II Esd. 19.13 ff.

(9) II Esd. 19.26, 29f, 34. R. Asting's Die Verkündigung, p.500) puts too narrow a construction on the word: "Bei diesem letzten Worten (μαρτύρια and διεμαρτύρειν in II Esd. 19.34) ist unmöglich an etwas anderes als in v.26 zu denken, wo es von den

The content of the testimony that Samuel is commanded to give Israel (I K.8.9) is not necessarily restricted to foretelling the behaviour of their prospective king. The Hebrew separates the two verbs and emphasises the separation by repeating the personal pronoun⁽¹⁾ thus: אֲנִי פִי-הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲנִי פִי-הַמֶּלֶךְ (I Sam. 8.9). The LXX repeats the pronoun αὐτοῖς but without the preposition. Also, there is in the preceding two verses a significant reference to the claim of God to full authority over Israel and to his bringing them out of Egypt.⁽²⁾ Some of Samuel's testimony is given later and in it the four aspects are present.⁽³⁾

The Authority of the Prophet or Witness is that of God who sends him and testifies through him⁽⁴⁾ for Micaiah says: "As the LORD liveth, what the LORD saith unto me, that will I speak."⁽⁵⁾ The authority of the prophetic witness is that of the teacher inspired by the spirit of God. There is an ecstatic type of prophecy exemplified by Saul and some others⁽⁶⁾ but this has little if any connection with the inspiration which David claims to have had in his life-time⁽⁷⁾ and which influenced Azariah the teaching priest⁽⁸⁾ who recalled the people to God by instructing them in the law⁽⁹⁾ and with that which

Propheten heisst, dass sie dem Volke Jahwäs Willen offenbaren (וְהִלְכִי) ." Adeney: Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther. p.302 remarks well: "The word Torah - law or instruction - must here be taken in its widest sense to comprehend both the utterances of the prophets and the traditions of the priests." as does T.W. Manson: op. cit., p.465: "The prophets are here clearly regarded as God's witnesses."

(1) The AV margin makes the division correctly, although with the traditional interpretation of διαμαρτυρεσθαι, "notwithstanding when thou hast solemnly protested against them, then thou shalt shew, etc."

(2) I K.8.7-9.

(3) (a) I K.12.10,12; (b) 12.4. (c) 12.6-9,11,24. (d) 12.14f,22.

(4) Jud.6.8, 13.8; II Chron.24.19, 25.15; IV. K.17.13; II Esd.19.30

(5) III K.22.14.

(6) I K.10.5f,10f; 19.20-24.

(7) II K.23.2.

(8) Cf. Lev. 10.11; II Chron.17.7-9.

(9) II Chron.15.1-3; cf. IV K.17.28.

possessed Jahaziel the Levite⁽¹⁾ and Zechariah the son of Jehoiada, another priest who was also a prophet.⁽²⁾ In the course of the hymn which they sang at the Feast of the Tabernacle the Levites, referring to the giving of the Torah in the desert, said: "Thou gavest them also thy good spirit to instruct them...and testifiedst (ἐπεμαρτύρω) to them by thy spirit by the hand of the prophets"⁽³⁾ thus showing that the teaching is a charisma.

The Authority of the Testimony

In this literature also it is difficult to separate the authority of the witness from that of his testimony, which is that of the truth sent by God⁽⁴⁾ and which, since no external sanction is possible, depends on whether the hearer is willing to 'see' or 'hear', or whether, having seen all that God has done, he then denies God⁽⁵⁾ or, having known all the works of the LORD, serves him.⁽⁶⁾ The usual reaction of Israel to the messengers of God and their words (which are God's words) is summed up in II Esdras 19.34: καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς ... οὐ προσέσχον τὰ μαρτύριά σου.⁽⁷⁾

The Transmission of the Testimony

However, in spite of all opposition, God's witnesses manage to ensure that their message is handed down; Moses passed it to Joshua;⁽⁸⁾ Joshua taught it to the people, writing a copy of it upon the stones of the altar in mount Ebal.⁽⁹⁾

-
- (1) II Chron. 20.14.
 (2) II Chron. 24.20; cf. IV. K. 12.2.
 (3) II Esd. 19.20, 30.
 (4) IV. K. 17.13.
 (5) Josh. 23.3; 24.27; cf. 9.2e; I. K. 8.7; IV. K. 17.14; II Chron. 24.19; II Esd. 19.26.
 (6) Josh. 24.29.
 (7) Cf. II Chron. 36.16.
 (8) Josh. 1.7; 4.10; cf. Sir. 46.1; Ass. Mos. 1.16.
 (9) Josh. 4.10; 9.2c.

The ark of the testimony was borne and guarded by the priests⁽¹⁾ and these, with the prophets, teach the people⁽²⁾ and prepare them that they may do according to the word of the LORD by the hand of Moses;⁽³⁾ the scribes, (e.g. Ezra, a ready scribe in the torah of Moses....who had prepared his heart to seek the law of the LORD and to do it and to teach in Israel statutes and judgements)⁽⁴⁾ were active in the work of transmission although always there was present the danger of losing sight of the basic idea of justice and mercy⁽⁵⁾ which characterised the dealings of God with his people and which they had covenanted to realise in their lives. The king also, it is to be noted, was regarded as the guardian of the torah for when he was anointed a copy of the testimony was placed in his hands.⁽⁶⁾

Conclusion.

From this study of the Historical Books of the O.T. it is seen that they encourage a similar conclusion to that drawn in the two previous sections, viz. that it is the possession of the torah or testimony, which is a gift of the Holy Spirit, which gives the teaching priest and the prophet their authority in Israel; but when the official guardians of the testimony depart from it, when there is no 'open vision', then God raises men without any official or hereditary qualification, as he did in the case of Samuel and Elijah and Elisha.

(1) Josh 4.16

(2) IV. K 17.28, II Chron 15.13, 17.7-9 ($\gamma\omega$, v.7 usually means 'commander' and is used for the priests in Is. 43.28.) (Gesenius, p. DCCXCIV. col.1); II Chron. 35.3; II Esd. 18.7.

(3) II Chron. 35.6.

(4) II Esd. 7.6, 10, 25.

(5) A danger to which Ezra and his fellows succumbed in dealing with the heathen wives.

(6) IV. K. 11.12. "apparently a written law-book." (C.F. Burney: Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings, p. 311. "i.e. the book of the law." (C.F. Keil: The Book of the Kings, pp. 361f.

(5) THE BOOK OF PSALMSThe Nature of the Testimony

In The Book of Psalms, especially in Psalm 118 which is very rich in examples, testimony is equated with the law in all its forms - torah,⁽¹⁾ judgements (κρίματα),⁽²⁾ statutes (δικαιώματα),⁽³⁾ precepts (ἐντολαί),⁽⁴⁾ commandments (πιάζ),⁽⁵⁾ God's word,⁽⁶⁾ his way,⁽⁷⁾ his wondrous works,⁽⁸⁾ truth,⁽⁹⁾ goodness, learning and knowledge (χρηστότης παιδεία and γνῶσις),⁽¹⁰⁾ God's name⁽¹¹⁾ and his righteousness.⁽¹²⁾ In Ps. 77.1-5 testimony or torah is described as 'the dark sayings of old'.⁽¹³⁾ God's testimony is something which he teaches.⁽¹⁴⁾ Ps.79 is described in the title as μαρτύριον τῷ Ἀσάφ but as there is very little in the subject-matter of the psalm to connect it with torah it is rather likely

(1) 18.8; cf. Delitzsch: Psalms. I.353: "The place of נִצְוֹת is taken by נִצְוֹת." 77.5,56; 80.6; 92.5; 98.7; 118.2.

(2) e.g. 118.3f.

(3) e.g. 118.33.

(4) e.g. 118.45; cf. 19.7.

(5) e.g. 118.35.

(6) e.g. 118.50.

(7) e.g. 118.37. H. Riesenfeld (Stud. Theol. I (1947), pp.148f):

"La metaphor de la voie n'illustre pas seulement le concept de conduite.....mais aussi l'idée de la direction et du bout, ce qui implique l'idée du salut préliminaire et définitif. (Ps. 118.37; Jer. 6.16; 21.8; Is. 35.8-10 etc)."

(8) e.g. Ps. 118.27.

(9) e.g. 118.43.

(10) 118.66.

(11) 118.55.

(12) 118.142.

(13) H. Gunkel (Die Psalmen. p 342) "gemeint ist nicht die Gesetzgebung in allgemein, sondern die Verpflichtung, die Überlieferung von Jahve's Taten weiter zu erzählen. cf. Ex 10.2".

(14) 131.12; cf. 49.7; 80.9.

that the reference is not to the words but the tune.⁽¹⁾ In Ps.24.10 the testimonies are closely associated with the covenant and in Ps.98.7 with the ordinances (προσταγματα) of God.

There are five psalms in which the Content of the Testimony is plainly set forth, viz. 49; 77; 80; 88 and 118. (a) The sovereignty of God is referred to; he is the mighty God, the LORD who owns all things; he is the LORD of nature, the most High; he will not tolerate the worship of other gods; no one can compare with him who controls even the raging of the sea; he is the creator of man.⁽²⁾ (b) Concerning the moral law, those who disobey it are rebuked; the testimony was established that Israel might keep God's commandments.⁽³⁾ (c) God's activity in history for the salvation of his people is noted; the salvation of God will be shown to the one who orders his way of life; the marvels of the Exodus are not to be forgotten.⁽⁴⁾ (d) The above-mentioned psalms include in their testimony the promise of God that he will deliver those who call upon him in the day of trouble and will show his salvation to those who live uprightly; God promises that he will establish David's seed for ever;⁽⁵⁾ Ps.32 is a new song (v. 3) compared with the Song of Moses in Deut.32 but the content is the same.⁽⁶⁾

(1) Kirkpatrick (Psalms, pp.483 f.) suggests that, as in the introduction to Ps.59, this is an instruction that the psalm be sung to the tune of another well-known psalm in praise of the law.

(2) 49.1.10-12; 77.13-17; 80.9f; 88.6-12; 118.73.

(3) Ps.49.16-21; 77.7f; 80.13; 88.15,30f.

(4) 49.23; 77.7,11-32,35,42f; 80.6,11. Schechter (Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, pp.122f.) notes that Ps.77 "which claims to be a Torah is nothing but a resumé of Israel's history."

(5) Ps.49. 15,23; 77.7; 80.10,16; 88.4,22,36f.

(6) (a) v. 6; (b) v. 5; (c) v. 19; (d) v. 22; cf. Ps. 97.

The Authority of the Witnesses

Throughout the Psalter no attempt is made by any writer to claim authority for himself other than that of the man who claims to speak God's word; any authority he has is that of the Holy Spirit who supplies the word.⁽¹⁾ All the emphasis is on the claims of the testimony itself which demands always complete subservience and loyalty. God speaks in the first person through the psalms of Asaph,⁽²⁾ throughout Ps. 118 it is the writer's prayer that God will teach him the all-sufficient torah and in Ps. 131.12 God says that he will teach his testimonies to the children of David. Even men like Moses and Aaron and Samuel have submitted to the yoke of the testimony; they may teach it but at the same time they are obedient to it.⁽³⁾ This is not to be wondered at since (it) they are the testimonies of God's mouth;⁽⁴⁾ the men are simply covenant-mediators.⁽⁵⁾

The Authority of the Testimony is a spiritual authority⁽⁶⁾ which could be defied by those who did not set their heart aright and whose spirit was not steadfast with God,⁽⁷⁾ who

(1) Ps. 50.12.

(2) Ps. 49.7. H.J. Kraus (Psalmen I. pp.376f.) writes concerning this verse. "Jahwe als Richter "zeugt" gegen sein Volk"; but the judgement is only on his enemies (v.16); he speaks of salvation for his people (v.15); 80.8.

(3) 98.6.

(4) 118.88.

(5) Cf. Kraus, (Psalmen, II. pp.684f: "Die Aufgabe des Bundesmittlers war es, als Fürbitter vor Jahweh zu treten, die Verkündigung des Rechts 'aus der Wolkensäule' aufzunehmen. Die Bundesmittler waren verantwortlich für die Übermittlung und Wahrung des Gottesrechts sowie auch für das ungestörte Bundesverhältnis (Fürbitte)."

(6) 50.12f.

(7) 77.8.

refused to walk in his law, or which could be accepted by those who remembered his name and kept his law.⁽¹⁾

The Transmission of the Testimony

The obligation to pass on the testimony from generation to generation is commented on in Ps. 77.1-6⁽²⁾ and the reward for this is noted in Ps. 131.12.

Conclusion

The Book of Psalms contains much that underlines all the foregoing conclusions. The testimony is identified with doctrine and similar expressions; the four-fold content is confirmed and the authority of the witness and of his testimony is traced back to God,⁽³⁾ that is to the faithful witness in heaven⁽⁴⁾ to whom the testimonies belong⁽⁵⁾ because he founded them for ever.⁽⁶⁾

(6) THE WISDOM LITERATURE

(1) THE BOOK OF PROVERBS

The Nature of the Testimony

The author of Proverbs has much to say about the torah and he uses many synonyms for it e.g. νόμος, παιδεία, γνώσις, εὐσέβεια, ὁδός, ἔλεγχος, ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου, βουλή, νοουθέτησις, σύνεσις, σωτηρία, διδασκαλία, ἐλεημοσύνη καὶ πίστις, φρόνησις all occurring in the first three chapters. Noteworthy is the

(1) 118.55. The above is not the same as G. Fitzer's attempt to show that the moral law in the hand of the priesthood took over from the testimony of the prophets and failed. (Der Begriff des Μάρτυρος, pp.57-61. The prophets and priests and psalmists knew that the moral law could not by its mere existence save a man and that only God's redemption could do this.

(2) Cf. 43.2; 89.1.

(3) Cf. Mt. 22.43.

(4) 88.38.

(5) 118.1f. etc.

(6) 118.152.

use of χάρις ⁽¹⁾ for this is an important factor in the interpretation of many New Testament passages. ⁽²⁾

The witness-concept is used in two senses in Proverbs; in four instances there is nothing to indicate anything but a simple legal sense, viz. 19.5,19; 19.28; ⁽³⁾ 24.28 and 25.18. In the other occurrences, however, there are indications that the true μάρτυς is the exponent of wisdom, torah, righteousness, testimony, and is contrasted with the man who teaches or acts contrary to the testimony (μαρτυρία in 12.19). ⁽⁴⁾

The faithful and true witness, the son (i.e. probably, the disciple) of wisdom is commanded to guard (φυλάσσειν) the torah of his father (teacher) ⁽⁵⁾ and to proclaim wisdom (Σὺ τὴν σοφίαν κηρύξεις) ⁽⁶⁾ but the μάρτυς ἄδικος who is equated with the ἀνὴρ ἄφρων ⁽⁷⁾ kindles falsehoods; ⁽⁸⁾ the son is δίκαιος

(1) Cf. Prov. 1.8f. where he who hears his father's παιδεία receives a crown of graces and a chain of gold about his neck and Prov. 3.3: "Let not mercy and truth (πίστις) forsake thee but bind them about thy neck; also Prov. 6.20f. where the teacher's laws are to hang as a chain around the disciple's neck and Prov. 3.22: "My son, let them (σοφία and φρόνησις) not pass from thee but keep my counsel and understanding.....that they may be χάρις round thy neck."

(2) e.g. Jn. 1.14; Ro. 1.5; 12.3,6; 15.15; I Cor. 15.10; cf. I Tim. 1.14; II Cor. 1.12; Gal. 2.9; Eph. 3.8; 4.7; II Thess. 2.16; II Tim. 1.9; 2.1; Heb. 10.29; 13.9; I Pet. 1.10; 4.10; 5.12: παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰς ἣν στήτε. ; II Pet. 3.18, Jude 4 and others.

(3) חַסְדִּים וְאֱמֻנָה: in A and Θ = μάρτυς παρὰ νόμος.

(4) Cf. Beyer: Die Apostelgeschichte: p.9. "So war im Spätjudentum der Prophet ein Zeuge Gottes."

(5) Prov. 6.20.

(6) 8.1.

(7) 6.12.

(8) 6.19.

who ἐπιδείκνυμένην πίστιν ἀπαγγέλλει and is opposed to the μάετος δόλιος ⁽¹⁾; the lips of just men drop graces (χάριτας) in contrast to the στόμα ἀσεβῶν which perverts (ἀποστρέφεται) ⁽²⁾ and the tongues of the wise heal for the law of the wise is a fountain of life.

12.19 shows the pre-occupation of the LXX translator with the idea of testimony for he translates ַעֲדָה and ַעֲדָהּ-ַעֲדָהּ by μαρτυρίαν and μάρτυς ταχύς and the text reads: χείλη ἀληθινὰ κατορθοῦσι μαρτυρίαν, μάρτυς δὲ ταχύς γλώσσαν ἔχει ἄδικον. (It is difficult to know what his readers would make of μάρτυς ταχύς, an expression which is used to describe the LORD himself in Mal.3.5.)

The μάρτυς πιστός does not lie while the μάρτυς ἄδικος kindles falsehoods and the former saves or redeems the soul from evil while the δόλιος also kindles falsehoods. ⁽³⁾ The Hebrew text of 19.28 speaks of a witness of Belial who scorns torah and is contrasted with the wise teacher of the previous verse. In 21.28 the μάρτυς ψευδής is opposed to the ἀνὴρ ὑπήκοος ⁽⁴⁾ (obedient, presumably, to the father who teaches wisdom), ⁽⁴⁾ who speaks φυλασσόμενος.

Finally, the author, in 29.14 says that the throne of the king who judges the poor in truth ⁽⁵⁾ will be established εἰς μαρτύριον. ⁽⁶⁾

(1) 12.17.

(2) 10.32.

(3) 14.25.

(4) Cf. Prov. 2.2; 4.3 and many others.

(5) Cf. 8.1-11.

(6) The Heb. is ambiguous: ַעֲדָה or ַעֲדָהּ.

All the above goes to show the probability that for the author of Proverbs the witness is, in the main, the teacher of righteousness, the hearer, obeyer, bearer and transmitter of the testimony⁽¹⁾ and is not regarded simply as a legal witness or eye-witness.⁽²⁾

The Content of this Testimony is as follows: (a) Its beginning is the fear of the LORD, the Creator;⁽³⁾ (b) It is concerned with the moral law of God - the son of wisdom consents not to sinners;⁽⁴⁾ (c) Wisdom has saving power.⁽⁵⁾ (d) Wisdom is life⁽⁶⁾ and the ways of the just shine like light, they advance and shine ἕως κατορθώσῃ ἡ ἡμέρα⁽⁷⁾. In these verses and in many others the fourfold message of the testimony is set forth clearly.

The Authority of the Witness

The true and faithful witness is completely under the sway of the testimony (ὑπακούσεται σοφίας τὸ οὖς σου) and is under obligation to hand it on to his son (disciple) (παρεβαλεῖς δὲ αὐτὴν ἐπὶ νοουθέτησιν τῷ υἱῷ σου⁽⁸⁾).

(1) Cf. Prov. 24.28: μὴ ἴσθι ψευδὴς μάρτυς ἐπὶ τὸν πολίτην and Jer. 38.34: καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν πολίτην. "We must not overlook the fact that there is a connection between the teacher of wisdom and the priest." (Östborn: Tora in the OT, pp.114ff.)

(2) as Toy: The Book of Proverbs, pp.128f. and Gemser: Sprüche Salomos, pp.31f.

(3) 1.7; 3.19.

(4) 1.10-19.

(5) 1.33.

(6) 3.18.

(7) 4.18.

(8) 2.2 etc.

The Authority of the Testimony

This testimony is a spiritual gift or grace-gift as is seen from various statements.⁽¹⁾ The μάετος, according to Proverbs, signifies principally the man who shows forth wisdom or torah rather than the one who provides eye-witness testimony of events; he has no sanction to support his authority other than the power of the truth which is an abiding spiritual gift.

The Transmission of the Testimony

The Book of Proverbs is full of praise for the torah and the man who loves it and learns it and passes it on to others. The son is to hear the instruction of his father and not to forsake the law of his mother (1.7f) and the writer urges his son or disciple to receive his words and hide his commandments with him (2.1; cf. 3.1,3). Children are told to hear the instruction of a father for he had been the pupil of his father before him, who had said: "Let thine heart retain my words; keep my commandments and live (4.1-5 etc). Those who pay heed to the wisdom of the father have within them a cistern and a well from which they have an endless supply (5.15) and the lips of the wise disperse knowledge (15.7). The author says that he has written in order to make the recipient know the certainty of the words of truth⁽²⁾ so that he in turn may be able to answer the words of truth to those who send to him (22.20f).⁽³⁾ The Tradition is to be preserved in its original purity, as is learned from Agur's instruction to Ithiel and Ucal: "Every word of God is pure.....Add thou not unto his words" (30.5f) and king Lemuel's prophecy which his mother had taught him includes the saying: "It is not for kings to drink wine....lest they drink and forget the law." (31.4f)

(1) e.g. 15.4: ἰασις γλώσσης δένδρον ζωῆς, ὃ δὲ συντηρεῖ αὐτὴν πλησθήσεται πνεύματος.; 1.8f; 1.23; 2.6; 4.2; 30.1,3.

(2) Cf. Lk. 1.1-4.

(3) I Pet. 3.15.

(ii) THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON AND SIRACHThe Nature of the Testimony

In these Apocryphal books there are several instances of simple witnessing of facts. In Wisdom it is stated that illegitimate children are witnesses against their parents in the day of judgement (4.6); the desolation around the Dead Sea bears silent testimony to the wickedness of the cities of the plain (10.7); wickedness is a coward thing and serves as a witness for its own prosecution (17.10); God is witness of the reins of the blasphemer (1.6). Sirach speaks of the testimony of generosity being everlasting (31.23), prays that God will give testimony to the first of his works (36.14) and repeats from I Kings 12.2-5 the phrase about Samuel calling God and his anointed to witness to his own blameless behaviour (46.19). The idea of testimony being prophecy is expressed in Sir. 36.14: δὸς μαρτύριον τοῖς ἐν ἀρχῇ κτισμασίν σου καὶ ἔγειρον προφητείας τὰς ἐπ' ὀνόματί σου. In Sir. 45.17 it is said that God: ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ (Aaron) ἐν ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ ἐξουσίαν ἐν διαθήκαις κειμάτων διδάξαι τὸν Ιακωβ τὰ μαρτύρια καὶ ἐν νόμῳ αὐτοῦ φωτίσαι Ισραὴλ and it is clear that τὰ μαρτύρια refers to the torah given by God to Moses: καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κατὰ πρόσωπον ἐντολὰς, νόμον ζωῆς καὶ ἐπιστήμης, διδάξαι τὸν Ιακωβ διαθήκην καὶ κείμενα αὐτοῦ τὸν Ισραὴλ (Sir. 45.5). Throughout Wisdom and Sirach many synonyms are used in this connection; προφητεία and παιδεία and διδασκαλία are linked in Sir. 24.32f; σοφία and παιδεία are equivalent terms in Sir. Prologue 3,12; prophecies are linked with the wisdom of the

ancients and the νόμος of the Most High in Sir. 39.1 and closely associated are words like διήγησις ⁽¹⁾, παραβολαί and Παροιμίαι. Σοφία, of course, is the key word of The Wisdom of Solomon and its equivalents are δικαιοσύνη (1.1), παιδεία, 1.5) γνῶσις (2.13), μυστήρια Θεοῦ (2.22), ἀρετή (4.1), ὁδὸς ἀληθείας (5.6), βουλή and νόμος (6.4), τὰ λογία (16.11), αἱ κρίσεις (17.1), ὁ λόγος and ἡ ἐπιταγή (18.15), Sirach uses φρόνησις (1.4), ἐπιστήμη, γνῶσις συνέσεως (1.19), ἔργα κρείου (2.15), ἀληθεία (4.25), περὶτάγματα and ἐντολαί (6.37), κρίσις and βουλή (25.4) and κρίματα and διαθήκη (45.5).

The Four-fold Content of the Torah or Testimony is shown in Sap. 10.1 - 16.29 and Sir. 16.24 - 18.24. In the former passage the sovereignty of God is stressed in 11.21 - 12.2; 12.12-18; 13.1-9; His moral law is referred to in 12.19 and idol-worship is said to conduce to disobedience of that law (13.10 - 14.31). The redemptive concern of God is seen in 15.1f; 16.6-13. The judgement of God that leads to life or death is mentioned in 12.21-27. In the Sirach passage the Lord is declared to be the Creator from the beginning (16.26 - 17.4); he showed men good and evil (17.6-20); his redeeming mercy is mentioned in 17.24 - 18.14 and finally his judgement is indicated in 18.24.

(1) He who meditates in the law of the Most High σοφίαν πάντων ἀρχαίων ἐξηγήσει, καὶ ἐν προφητείαις ἀσχοληθήσεται, διήγησιν ἀνδρῶν ὀνομαστῶν συντηρήσει. Διήγησις is used of the Gospel narratives in Lk. 1.1 and Euseb. Eccl. Hist. 3.14.7; 3.39.12.



The Authority of the Witness is a teaching authority as is shown by Sir.45.5,17 where Moses and Aaron are given authority to teach Jacob-Israel the μαρτυρία . ὁ δίκαιος , the true and faithful witness professes to have knowledge of God, names himself παῖς κυρίου (Sap.2.12f) and boasts that God is his father (2.16). The authority of the witness springs from that of the testimony or wisdom (Sap.8.10;9.17) and this thought is stressed by Sirach who in his hymn of praise for the men of piety includes among them prophets and scribes (44.3f) and says of them that "they were honoured in their generation and in their day had glory (44.7). Again, Sirach, in describing the ideal scribe shows conclusively that the latter's knowledge of the law and his teaching office give him an authority superior to that of the craftsman and the labourer in the office of counsellor and judge. Of the manual workers it is said: "In the assembly they shall not mount on high; they shall not sit on the seat of the judge, and they shall not understand the covenant of judgement." (38.33). But of the ideal scribe it is written:

"Not so he that applieth himself to the fear of God,
 And to set his mind upon the Law of the Most High;
 Who searcheth out the wisdom of all the ancients,
 And is occupied with the prophets of old;
 Who heedeth the discourses of men of renown,
 And entereth into the deep things of parables;
 Searcheth out the hidden meaning of proverbs,
 And is conversant with the dark sayings of parables;

.....

If it seem good to God Most High,
 He shall be filled with the spirit of understanding.

.....

He himself declareth wise instruction,
 And glorieth in the Law of the Lord.

His understanding many do praise,

And never shall his name be blotted out." (39.1-3,6,8).

Further evidence of the dependence of the witness' authority upon the testimony which he teaches is provided by Sir.1.19: "(God) exalted the honour of them that hold her (wisdom) fast."; "Wisdom exalts her sons." (4.11); among the 'famous men' of Sir.44 are those who have given counsel by their understanding and have brought tidings in prophecies: ἡγούμενοι λαοῦ ἐν διαβουλίαις καὶ συνέσει γραμματείας λαοῦ, σοφοὶ λόγοι ἐν παιδείᾳ αὐτῶν (Sir.44.3); finally it is significant that the second thing said about Joshua the son of Nun is that he was the successor of Moses in prophecies. (Sir.46.1).

That the Authority of the Testimony is due to its being a spiritual gift or charisma is seen from several passages in Wisdom and Sirach. The author of Wisdom called upon God and there came to him Spirit of wisdom (7.7); wisdom is a vapour of the power of God, a clear effluence of the glory of the Almighty (7.25); the author admits that he could not otherwise possess wisdom unless God gave her and identifies σοφία and χάρις (8.21); In 9.17 he asks: "Who gained knowledge of thy counsel, except thou gavest wisdom, and sentest thy Spirit from on high? And it was thus that.....men were taught the things that are pleasing unto thee and through wisdom were they saved." (9.18). This saving power of the testimony is also mentioned in Sap.10. 1,4,5,9,15-21. Sirach declares that wisdom was created by God and is his free gift

to those who love him (1.10; cf. v. 26 and 24.3); grace shall be found on the lips of the wise (21.16; cf. 37.21). Although it is not specifically mentioned there is a reference to the Tabernacle of Testimony in Sir. 24.8-12 where wisdom says: ἐν σκηνῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐλειτούργησα καὶ ἐν ἱερουσαλὴμ ἡ ἐξουσία μου.

The Transmission of the Testimony

The testimony was to be jealously guarded and the author of Wisdom upbraids the 'kings and judges of the earth' ὅτι ὑπερέται ὄντες τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας οὐκ ἐκρίνατε ὁρθῶς οὐδὲ ἐφυλάξατε νόμον . . . (6.4) but he himself, having learned without guile, imparts without grudging (7.13). Wisdom passes into holy souls from generation to generation (7.27) and the Israelites were bitten by the serpents in the desert to put them in remembrance of God's oracles and were quickly saved not by herb or poultice but by the word of the Lord which heals all things. (16.11f). According to Sirach those who hold fast to wisdom have their glory exalted by God (1.19) and the father and mother are to be honoured by their children paying heed to their instruction in wisdom (3.1-6). Sirach's readers are not to neglect the discourse of the wise; they are to be conversant with their proverbs and are not to miss the discourse of the aged for they also learned of their fathers and because from them is learned understanding and to give answer in time of need. (8.8f). Wisdom herself speaks: "I will yet bring instruction to light as the morning. . . . I will yet pour out doctrine as prophecy and leave it unto generations of ages." (24.32f); the ideal scribe "shall show forth the instruction which he hath been taught, and shall glory in the law of the covenant of the Lord. Many shall commend his understanding; and so long as the world endureth, it shall not be blotted out: his memorial

shall not depart, and his name shall live from generation to generation" (39.8f). Finally, the Most High has arranged the mighty things of his wisdom.....nothing has been added to them or diminished from them (42.21).

Conclusion

In those books of the Wisdom Literature in which the μάγιστρος word-group appears there is evidence that the teaching office in Israel was held in the highest esteem and this by reason of the doctrine or testimony. This testimony is called by many names all of which point to a body of truth which embraces the four aspects of the Mosaic torah already noted. The testimony is not in any way eye-witness testimony but is the result of spiritual 'vision' and is of the nature of doctrine; it is 'grace', a gift of the Spirit of God and itself a spiritual matter although its content, broadly speaking, remains constant and so it can be called not only παιδεία and διδασκαλία but also προφητεία. Thus the testimony, (and consequently the witness) has no authority other than that of the truth; it is recognised by the man of faith as a result of the action of the Spirit in his mind for, as the author of Wisdom says: "Wisdom passes into holy souls from generation to generation, she maketh men friends of God and prophets." So, the original μαρτύριον of Moses the first witness of God's sovereignty, moral law, redeeming action and future judgement is handed on that all men may have the opportunity of laying hold on eternal life (Sir.15.3).

Jesus, who truly and faithfully spoke and embodied the authentic prophetic testimony of the Scriptures was debtor not only to the canonical authors of the OT but also to Wisdom and Sirach, to the Wisdom literature as well as to Moses and the prophets.

(7) JOB

Job 10.17 translates עֵינַי as ἑτασίν μου = 'my scrutiny' (presumably God's scrutiny of Job) which has some affinity with v.14: "If I sin then thou watchest me." God is the all-seeing witness.

In 15.6 καταμαρτυρεῖν is used for the accusing testimony of Job's own lips and in v.34 of the same chapter μαρτύριον is used as a legitimate translation of עֵינַי (instead of συναγωγή).

In 16.8 Job's falsehood is said to have become εἰς μαρτύριον and in 16.19 he calls God ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὁ μάρτυς μου⁽¹⁾.

Finally the LXX renders עָנָה (29.11) as ἐξέκλινε which carries over the literal meaning of עָנָה = 'to turn back'.

Conclusion

There is no evidence in the Book of Job of any use of the μάρτυς group in connection with the prophetic testimony.

(1) This is followed by the parallel phrase: ὁ δὲ συνίστωρ μου ἐν ὑψίστοις . Cf. Soph. Phil. 1293: οἱ θεοὶ συνίστορες.

(8) THE EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC PROPHETSThe Nature of the Testimony

It is most unlikely that someone with the spiritual insight and literary skill and sensibility of the author of Deutero-Isaiah would use the *μαρτυς*-group without a conscious reference to the *μαρτυρίου* which Moses and his successors had given to Israel to keep and testify.⁽¹⁾ The context and content of Isaiah 43,44 demonstrate that for the author the *μαρτυς* who is Jacob-Israel⁽²⁾ is the servant-prophet⁽³⁾ who declares the truth.⁽⁴⁾ God and his chosen⁽⁵⁾

(1) Dt. 4.1-6,9f. etc. against Strathmann: "Man von einem 'Zeugenbegriff' bei Deuterojesaja nicht reden kann...Es handelt sich auch bei ihm um einen bildlichen Ausdruck, den er gelegentlich benutzt." (KWB. IV. 488.7f.).

(2) Cf. Günther, *Μάρτυς*. Die Geschichte eines Wortes. p. 88. NB. Sing. *μαρτυς* in 42.1 and plur. *μαρτυρες* and *δοῦλοι* in 42.19; cf. E. Lohmeyer, *RHPR*. (1927), p. 319: "Tout le peuple est destiné à être un témoin, mais souvent ce n'est que l'individu qui réalise cette mission." Philo's etymology of 'Israel' is interesting in this connection: *τοῦτων ἐστὶν ὁ Χαλδαῖστί μὲν προσαναγορευόμενος Ἰσραήλ Ἑλληνιστί δὲ ὁρῶν θεόν.* (De Praemiis et Poenis, VII. 44. (Loeb ed. VIII. pp. 337-9)).

(3) Cf. Morgenstern: *The Ark, the Ephod and the "Tent of Meeting"*. p. 138.

(4) 43.9.

(5) Cf. Sass: *ZNW*. 40(1941), p. 26: "So macht allein die Erwählung, der Auftrag Gottes einen Menschen oder ein Volk zum *עַדְוָה*." and p. 27: "Einen *עַדְוָה* im ATliche Sinne gibt es nur dort, wo ein lebendiger Gott sich offenbart und handelt."

servant παῖς are described as μαρτυρῶν⁽¹⁾ and the people, Israel, are witnesses of what God has already published,⁽²⁾ of his sovereignty and salvation,⁽³⁾ to tell forth his praises,⁽⁴⁾ having been filled with his Spirit.⁽⁵⁾ Israel is God's witness, from the beginning, of his sole lordship over against the idols.⁽⁶⁾ The idol worshippers have no understanding to perceive the truth of God.⁽⁷⁾ Since Jacob-Israel is God's παῖς he has to remember these things, that is, to keep on reminding himself and others.⁽⁸⁾ This idea, however, goes back to the time of Moses, so F. Dornseiff⁽⁹⁾ is hardly correct in seeing D-I as the source of the technical term μαρτυρῶν.

(1) 43.10; cf. Dodd (The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p.168: "In John and Isaiah alike, the content of μαρτυρῶν is the ἐγὼ εἰμι (אֲנִי הָאֵלֹהִים), which expresses the divine nature. In Isaiah it is the ἐγὼ εἰμι of Jehovah: the knowledge of which he speaks is a recognition of the unique and eternal majesty of God as the Ruler of the universe and Redeemer of his people. In John it is the ἐγὼ εἰμι of Christ as Logos and Son of God: as the bearer and revealer, therefore, of that same majesty."

(2) GA. Smith: The Book of Isaiah, II, pp.158ff. and especially p.300: "The burden of the Servant's work" is "to pervade and instruct every nation's life on earth with the righteousness and piety that are ordained to God." The content here is too narrow but the conception of the function is correct; cf. p.265: "Zion as a whole is to be a herald of good news (xl.9)."

(3) Best: SJT 12(1959), p.135: "the prophets re-interpret so that new meaning appears."

(4) 43.21.

(5) 44.3.

(6) 44.8.

(7) 44.18.

(8) 44.21.

(9) Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, 22(1923/5), p.135; also Schlatter (Der Märtyrer in den Anfängen der Kirche, (1915), p.245) is incorrect in confining the marks of the witness to (a) 'speaking of what he has seen, his word does not rest on hearsay' and (b) 'waging, through his word, the judicial contest of God against the opposing world.'

μάετος, except in the sense that this particular member of the word-group is used here for the first time with this particular meaning; but there is no justification for singling out one member of the group to give it a particular meaning, for this is to deny what it has in common with the other members.

In Is. 55.3f the author speaks of the covenant which God will make with his people; it will be like the one he made with David. As God ordained David for a μαρτύριον,⁽¹⁾ that is, a reminder of the covenant to the nations, a prince and a leader to the peoples, so shall his seed be prophets to the Gentiles. However, this will be only for those who give heed with their ears and follow God's ways.⁽²⁾

In Jeremiah 6.10, after pronouncing doom on Jerusalem the false city (v.6) whose ears cannot hear the word (ῥῆμα) of God because it has become a reproach (v.10), God says through the prophet: πρὸς τίνα λαλήσω καὶ διαμαρτύρωμαι καὶ ἀκούσεται; All have gone against the law, from priest to false prophet (v.13) so Jeremiah calls on them to ask for the old paths of the LORD and to walk in the good way (v.16). God has set watchmen (σκοπούς) over them saying: "Hear the sound of the trumpet (v.17)" and calling on them not to rely on the temple but to correct their ways (7.4-6).

(1) μαρτύριον but the Heb: 7% means 'witness' rather than 'testimony'. Smith, (Isaiah II, p.404 and note): 'a witness, (that is, a prophet)'. Strathmann (KWB. IV. p.488. 34-9) refers to David as a testimony, because of all God has done for him, to God's grace and power. Asting (Die Verkündigung, p.492) notes that David is seen together with Israel.

(2) Aquila has μαρτυρεα.

Theodotion makes good the LXX omission of Jeremiah 11.7 and part of 8 and translates: ὅτι ἐπιμαρτυρία ἐπεμαρτυράμεν τοῖς πατέρασιν ὑμῶν... καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρούμενος. Here 'to testify' means to recall to the original covenant-relationship, to obedience on the part of the servant⁽¹⁾ to the word of God. In Jer. 49.5 the men of Jerusalem agree to accept Jeremiah's interpretation of the law as true and faithful testimony (cf. 49.3: "Let the LORD thy God declare to us the way wherein we should walk and the thing (λόγον) which we should do, and 49.5: Let the LORD be between us for a just and faithful μαρτυρία if we do not according to every word which the LORD shall send us.") In vv. 19f. (Heb. and Aquila) this testimony is referred to again (διεμαρτυράμεν ὑμῖν σήμερον) and in 37.20 and 51.23 the torah of God is further mentioned as τὰ μαρτύρια.

Finally, there is a very interesting passage (39.6-44) where Jeremiah redeems a plot of ground from his cousin although he foresees the overthrow of the nation. The strong emphasis laid upon the evidence of purchase signed by the witnesses points up an obvious connection with the redemption of Israel by God.⁽²⁾ After delivering the evidence of the purchase to Baruch the prophet prays to God, addressing him as the creator of heaven and earth, who gives to everyone according to his ways, who rescued his people from Egypt and promised them a land flowing with milk and honey. In a sense, the legal testimony is the evidence that God, having redeemed them once, will save them again in spite of their rejection of his teaching.

(1) The olive tree is the two houses of Israel and Judah (11.16; cf. Rev. 11.3f). Weiser (Der Prophet Jeremia I. p. 102) notes the connection with the covenant but thinks of testimony as simply 'Ermahnung'.

(2) Taking this as an acted parable.

The author of Lamentations uses μαρτυρεῖν in connection with the torah (2.13) Jerusalem has grievously sinned and Judah has gone into captivity (1.8,3); the torah is no more; her prophets also find no vision from the Lord⁽¹⁾ and so Jeremiah, wishing to comfort the city,⁽²⁾ cries: "What shall I testify to you, or what parable shall I tell you?"⁽³⁾ There can be little doubt that the question is in the form of a Hebrew poetic parallelism and that in the mind of the author testimony is doctrine and to testify is to teach.⁽⁴⁾

In Ezekiel 16.1ff the prophet is instructed by a word of the LORD: διαμαρτυρεαι τῇ ἱερουσαλημ τὰς ἀνομίας αὐτῆς . This does not simply mean to catalogue vices; it includes also the story of the nation's creation (v.6), its cleansing and the marriage- covenant with God (v.8), the breaking of the covenant (vv.16-34), the threat of judgement and punishment and a further promise of the raising up (ἀναστήσω) of an everlasting covenant (vv.60,62) and reconciliation (v.63). Διαμαρτυρεσθαι is used in the same way in Ezek.20.4ff. where the testifying is to other aspects of the original torah, viz. the choosing of Israel and God's helping them at the Exodus (vv.5f), the promised land (v.6), the giving of the moral law (v.10), the rebellion (v.13), the threat (v.17) and the promise of future blessedness (vv.40-44). All this is repeated in the testimony referred to in Ezek.20.4 whose content is given in the remainder of the chapter.

(1) With Kraus: Klagelieder. (1956), pp. 40f. This is an instance of the use of μαρτυρεῖν in a context which shows conclusively that the prophetic testimony is not always condemnatory.

(2) 2.13.

(3) This is similar to Jer.6.10 where the words are spoken before the doom has occurred. The meaning of the first question, according to the Midrash Rabba (Soncino ed. (1939)) is: "How many prophets did I (God) send to warn you?"

(4) Cf. Mk.4.30.

Zephaniah proclaims the nearness of the great day of the LORD (1.7) which will be terrible for Judah who will not receive or trust in the LORD or draw near to him (3.2); her prophets and priests transgress the law (3.4) so God says to his people: ὑπομεινόν με .. εἰς ἡμέραν ἀναστασεώς μου εἰς μαρτύριον (3.8). Here again the testimony is connected with the original Mosaic one. (a) God is he who judges the nations (3.8); (b) transgression of the law is condemned (3.4); (c) Jerusalem is described as ἡ ἀπολελυτωμένη (3.1,15) and there is a forecast of doom (3.20) or blessedness (3.13,15,17).

In Zechariah 3.6 the messenger of the LORD testified διεμαρτύρετο⁽¹⁾ to Joshua and here again there is a clear connection with the familiar content (a) the LORD is παντοκράτωρ (3.9) (b) Joshua must walk in his ways (3.7); (c) Joshua's iniquities are taken away (3.4); (d) There is a promise of future blessing (3.7f.).

In Malachi 2.14 God claims to have been a witness to Israel's deserting of the law and truth, the wife of his youth,⁽²⁾ for the priests have not testified (2.7f.). Then in Malachi 3.5-7 the prophet foretells the future coming of the LORD in judgement as a swift witness⁽³⁾ to all who have perverted his statutes and failed to keep them.

(1) Günther: Μάρτυς pp. 80f. is concerned to emphasise the apocalyptic aspect of the witness and translates διεμαρτύρετο as 'revealed'. The passage must certainly have been useful to the early church as a prophetic testimony to the coming Messiah; e.g. Lk. 1.78; Ac. 1.22; 2.32.

(2) Cf. 2.10; Jer. 3.14f,19f; Prov. 5.1-20, esp. 18.

(3) Unlike Moses who was "slow of speech and of a slow tongue". Cf. Ps. 147.4; Rev. 2.4f,16; 3.11.

In these writings the testimony has numerous synonyms, viz. torah,⁽¹⁾ the word of the LORD,⁽²⁾ good news,⁽³⁾ instruction,⁽⁴⁾ the path of judgement, knowledge, the way of understanding.⁽⁴⁾ The testimony may be a prophecy or an oracle as in the case where Jeremiah is sent by the people to enquire of the LORD about their future and brings back the message which God has testified.⁽⁵⁾ The testimony is identified with the covenant made at Sinai.⁽⁶⁾ Malachi shows that the commandment, the covenant, the torah of truth, knowledge and the way are all synonymous.⁽⁷⁾ According to Isaiah the witness or servant (παῖς) teaches God's torah⁽⁸⁾ and Jeremiah links instruction and testimony very closely when he says that God sent his servants (δοῦλοι) the prophets⁽⁹⁾ but no one listened to them or received instruction (παιδεία).

(1) e.g. Is.42.24.

(2) e.g. Is.40.8; 55.11; Jer.6.10 etc.

(3) e.g. Is.40.9; 52.7. רָשָׁא (Piel. רָשָׁא has the basic meaning of 'to bear good tidings' (Gesenius p CXLVI). LXX has εὐαγγελίζομαι.

(4) Is.40.14.

(5) Jer.49.4,19; cf.50.10. Not necessarily an accusing or judging testimony as Volz: Jesaja II, p.361. Schechter (Aspects, p.24) says that it almost seems that "to the Rabbis and their followers the Revelation at Sinai and all that it implies, was to them not a mere reminiscence or tradition, but that through their intense faith, they re-witnessed it in their own souls, so that it became to them a personal experience."

(6) Jer.11.1-10; cf. Ezek.16.60-63; 16.2; 20.4.

(7) Mal.2.4-9.

(8) Is.42.4,7; cf. Jer.6.19; 9.13; 16.11; 51.23. Strathmann refuses to see here any direct connection with the early Christian witness-idea. KWB. IV. 488.19-21.

(9) 7.25,28.

God, through the prophet, tells Jerusalem to be instructed and then cries: To whom shall I speak and testify (διαμαρτύρομαι)?⁽¹⁾ The testimony is the original teaching about God, his nature and his demand, which is rooted in the past, in the conscience of man; it is 'the old paths and the good way' in which men find rest for their souls.⁽²⁾ The testimony is also described as a vision; for Ezekiel, the heavens were opened and he saw visions of God (a pictorial way of saying that the word of the LORD came to him);⁽³⁾ Jeremiah describes true prophecy as a vision out of the mouth of the LORD;⁽⁴⁾ the vision of the prophet is set along-side the torah of the priest and the counsel of the ancients (πρεσβύτεροι)⁽⁵⁾ and testifying is also described as 'showing God's words' (ἀναγγελλεῖν)⁽⁶⁾.

When the Content of the Testimony is examined it is seen to follow the pattern of the Mosaic teaching.⁽⁷⁾ The basis of it is (a) the sovereignty of God the creator who alone is real in distinction from all the idols. He is the LORD who created Jacob-Israel; he is the king of Israel; he is the first and the last; he is the controller of nature.⁽⁸⁾ (b) God

(1) Jer.7.28; 6.8,10;cf.39.33; 42.13,15; Zeph.3.2,4,8.

(2) Jer.6.16;cf.7.23 and Mal.2.9.

(3) Ezek.1.1,3;cf.8.3 etc.; Hab.2.2f; Nah.1.1; Ob.1.1.

(4) Jer.23.16.

(5) Ezek.7.26.

(6) Jer.16.10; 42.4cf.Jn.16.13-15; Ac.20.20; Ro.15.21;

I Pet.1.12; I Jn.1.5.

(7) Michel: (Ev.Theol. 2(1935). p.234) sees a development in Isaiah 43,44 from the Deuteronomic and priestly concept of the testimony and (note 6) thinks of the content in terms of what God is doing and will do rather than of what he has done.

(8) Is.43.1,10,15; 44.6,8; 55.9; Jer.5.22,24; 11.10, 51.3; Ezek.16.15-20; 20.7.

makes a moral demand upon men as is shown clearly in his condemnation of their sin which has wearied him, the just God, and in many other references.⁽¹⁾ (c) The God who rules over all and demands righteousness is also the God who redeems his chosen ones and blots out their transgressions.⁽²⁾ (d) God makes promises of future good or ill according as Israel is obedient and faithful or not; when they pass through the waters he will be with them....He will bring them out of captivity; he will pour out his Spirit and his blessing upon their children but Israel must hear and obey otherwise they will be punished.⁽³⁾

If what follows Lam.2.13 is the prophet's message then it is possible to discern here also the four features of the content for God is said to be the most High who is God in the heavens, the LORD who remains for ever (3.35,41; 5.19) it is because Israel has transgressed and rebelled that she is being punished, for the sins of her prophets and the iniquities of her priests that have shed the blood of the just in the midst of her (3.42; 4.13); God has pleaded the cause of Israel's soul and has redeemed her life (3.58); the captivity is the fulfilment of God's word spoken in days gone by but there is still hope for the future and a man should wait quietly for the salvation of the LORD, and his future vindicating of his people (2.17; 3.26,21f; 4.22).

(1) Is. 43.24-27; 45.21; 55.7; Jer.6.16; 7.5,8f.,23; 9.23; 51.10,23; Ezek. 20.11-31.

(2) Is.40.1,3,11,14,29; 44.6,22-24; 45.21; 55.5; Jer.7.23,25; 11.4,7^o; 14.8; Ezek.16.3-14; 20.5f. Lohmeyer (RHPR. (1927) p. 318) is incorrect in saying that the conception of Jacob-Israel as God's witness, since it is purely a matter of election, "se distingue avec une netteté suffisante de celle du prophétisme israélite. Elle ne fait plus de reflexion sur l'histoire du passé." It must be realised that suffering is not the function of the witness but the consequence of his testifying.

(3) Is.43.2; 43.5f.,3; 44.25; Jer.7.13-15; 9.15; cf.11.4; 11.11; 12.14-17; 49.11f; Ezek.16.36-59; 20.8; 20.33; 16.60-63; cf. 20.40-44.

The Authority of the Prophetic Witness is once again seen to be that of the man whom God has called and sent and who has nothing to support his claim but the self-authenticating character of his message, a message which is one with that of Moses and his prophetic successors. In Isaiah the witness is Jacob-Israel, God's prophet or Messiah and his servant (δοῦλος or παῖς)⁽¹⁾ as are the previous prophets;⁽²⁾ he is chosen by God⁽³⁾ called by God from the womb,⁽⁴⁾ sent by God⁽⁵⁾ and his Spirit⁽⁶⁾ as a messenger⁽⁷⁾ to declare his glory;⁽⁸⁾ he is also described as a πνευματικός in Is. 55.4, i.e. a "spiritual" proof of God's grace and power; God has put his Spirit upon

(1) Is. 42.19; 55.4; cf. Jer. 37.10 (Heb); Ezek. 28.25.

(2) "A direct line leads from prophet to suffering servant since it is the eschatological fate of the prophet to suffer in fulfilment of his function." (Cullmann; The Christology of the New Testament (1959), p. 44).

(3) 41.8f; 43.10; 44.1; Jer. 26.27f; Ezek. 20.5.

(4) Is. 49.1; cf. Jer. 1.5.

(5) Is. 42.19 (Heb); Jer. 1.7; Ezek. 2.3; Hag. 1.12; Mal. 3.1.

(6) Is. 48.16.

(7) Is. 42.19 (Heb); Mal. 3.1.

(8) Is. 66.19. "God justly boasts that they are his witnesses and that he has true witnesses, for the Jews had been instructed by heavenly oracles as far as was necessary for attaining perfection. Yet he indirectly reproaches them with ingratitude if they do not openly declare that they know everything that is necessary for maintaining the glory of God. And indeed he calls them to bear witness." (Calvin: Isaiah, in Calvin Transl. Society, III (1852), p. 329). And Volz (Jesaja II pp. 40f.) ascribes an active as well as a passive function to God's witnesses: "Israel sollte das Volk des Gottesbeweises werden. Das Zeugenamt ist zunächst passiv. Israel ist durch sein Dasein und durch sein Geschick Zeuge für Jahwehs Einzigartigkeit.....Aber das Zeugenamt Israels ist doch zugleich auch aktiv, nämlich so, dass das auserwählte Volk seinen Glauben an Jahweh in der Welt behaupten und vertreten sollte."

the witness for he has anointed him to preach good news to the meek; it is the same Holy Spirit whom God put within Moses; it is by the Spirit that Ezekiel is taken up and shown his visions; according to Zechariah the words which the LORD sent by the former prophets he sent in his Spirit and Joel tells of the coming day when God will pour out his Spirit upon all flesh and the people will prophesy.⁽¹⁾ The witness comes as a teacher and the isles shall eagerly await his torah⁽²⁾ for the LORD God has given him the tongue of the learned, that he should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary.....he wakens his ear to hear as the learned.⁽³⁾ The teaching of the prophets is opposed to the teaching of the false prophets, the diviners, dreamers, enchanters and sorcerers who prophesy lies⁽⁴⁾ and teach rebellion against the LORD.⁽⁵⁾ The false prophets who claim to be God's official spokesmen are like a roaring lion ravaging the prey;⁽⁶⁾ they have taken money and the priests, the leaders with hereditary authority, have violated God's torah;⁽⁷⁾ they prophesy out of their own hearts, they follow their own spirit; they have seen nothing⁽⁸⁾ and camouflage with plaster the flimsy wall they have built.⁽⁹⁾ Both true and false prophets claim to speak in God's name and when the true prophet is rejected he can only appeal to his own faith in God's future vindication.⁽¹⁰⁾ Jeremiah proclaims

(1) Is. 42.1; 59.21; 61.1; 63.11; Ezek.11.24; 37.1; Zech.7.12; Joel 3.1f.

(2) Is. 42.4. (LXX: *ὁ νόμος*).

(3) Is. 50.4f.

(4) Jer.34.9.

(5) Jer.35.15.

(6) Ezek.22.25,27.

(7) Jer.23.9-40; 34.9; 35.15; Ezek.12.1-23; 22.25-28; Zeph.3.4.

(8) Ezek.13.2f.

(9) Cf. CD.8.12.

(10) Jer.14.14 and 20.9; 35.9; Ezek.33.33.

that God did not give any instructions about sacrifices at the time of the Exodus but that the burden of his commandment was that they should obey his voice and walk in his ways and that it is in order to remind them of this instruction that God keeps on sending his prophets.⁽¹⁾ The priests were entrusted with the torah and the teaching of it⁽²⁾ and are so jealous of their authority that they are prepared to destroy anyone who opposes it.⁽³⁾ Malachi also speaks of the priests who despise God's name in spite of the covenant which he had made with Levi in whose mouth was the torah of truth....for the priest's lips should keep knowledge and they should seek the torah at his mouth: for he is the messenger⁽⁴⁾ of the LORD of hosts..... but the priests have been partial in the law and so God has made them contemptible and base before all the people.⁽⁵⁾

That the witness has no concern for his own life, far less his position, is demonstrated by Jeremiah who, when the official priests and prophets accuse him before the princes and the people, tells the latter that they may do with him as they please but nevertheless his message still holds; it is because of this stand and not because of any official position which he may have held that the princes and the people recognise that Jeremiah really has spoken by the authority of God.⁽⁶⁾

(1) Jer. 7.22-28.

(2) Lev. 10.11; cf. Ezek. 44.23.

(3) Jer. 18.18; 33.11,

(4) For the priest and prophet as 'messenger' or 'apostle' who bears the torah or testimony see Ostborn: Tora in the OT, pp. 52, 165-8; cf. II Chron. 36.15f. where prophet = messenger; Mal. 3.1; Is. 42.19. (Heb).

(5) Mal. 1.6; 2.4-9.

(6) Jer. 33.11-16.

The Teaching of the Witness is given by the Spirit of God, as has been noted, and, as such, claims a supreme authority.⁽¹⁾ Isaiah asks: "Who hath known the mind of the LORD, or, being his counsellor hath taught him".⁽²⁾ The word of the servant is confirmed by God and he performs the counsel of his messengers. In Isaiah's prophecy God says: "I will put my words in thy mouth."⁽³⁾ Jeremiah at his commissioning is told that he will speak whatever God commands;⁽⁴⁾ the testimony is plainly described as God's word⁽⁵⁾ and as God's torah which he has set before Israel.⁽⁶⁾ God's Spirit which is upon Israel and his word which he has put in their mouth shall not depart from them according to Isaiah⁽⁷⁾ and this would appear to equate Spirit and word as would also the later statement that the Spirit of the LORD is upon the prophet for the sake of his message.⁽⁸⁾ Since it is a statement of truth the testimony has no sanction other than its appeal to conscience and need; it depends for its authority on whether the hearer 'sees' or does not 'see'.⁽⁹⁾ Zechariah makes it clear that the authority promised to Joshua the high priest depends upon his obedience to the torah: If thou wilt walk in my ways....then thou shalt also judge my house....and I will give thee...."⁽¹⁰⁾ and Malachi underlines

(1) Too much has been made of the ecstatic nature of prophecy. Rengstorff (Apostleship, pp. 56-58) regards Jeremiah alone as having continuous possession of the revelation of the will of God.

(2) Is. 40.13f.

(3) Is. 51.16.

(4) Jer. 1.7, 17.

(5) Jer. 6.10.

(6) Jer. 33.4.

(7) Is. 59.21.

(8) Is. 61.1; cf. Zech. 7.12; 1.6.

(9) Is. 42.18-20; 41.20; 43.8; 44.18; 50.5; 55.3; Jer. 6.10; 7.26; 22.21; Zech. 1.4; 7.11f; Is. 42.24; Jer. 9.12; Zeph. 3.2; Jer. 8.8f; Zeph. 1.6; Is. 53.1.

(10) Zech. 3.7.

the fact that the priests, the hereditary leaders are under obligation to obey the torah of truth, the covenant made with Levi. Those priests who have departed out of the way, caused many to stumble at the torah, corrupted the covenant and been partial in the torah will be cursed by God.⁽¹⁾ From these examples it is seen that it is the teaching of the priests which carries the authority rather than the office which they hold. When they fail to uphold the original testimony their authority is hollow. It is hardly likely that Jesus and the early church, being so deeply imbued with the prophetic spirit, would adhere to a different principle; indeed it was the challenge presented by Jesus the unofficial teacher⁽²⁾ to the forfeited authority of the priests which aroused their enmity.

The Transmission of the Testimony

The exilic and post-exilic prophets were convinced of the paramount importance of the basic testimony and the necessity of its being made known to everyone so that all might be confronted by its claims. Isaiah insists that God has always been declaring his truth and his righteousness and therefore his generation ought to be handing it on.⁽³⁾ The prophet foretells that in the coming blessed time all their children will be taught by the LORD,⁽⁴⁾ God's spirit and his words must not depart out of Israel's mouth nor out of the mouth of their seed or their seed's seed⁽⁵⁾ and Jeremiah notes the obligation laid upon the priesthood and the official prophets to teach the people,⁽⁶⁾ a matter which is also stressed by Malachi,⁽⁷⁾ but the ideal situation is seldom found.

(1) Mal.2.1-9.

(2) Cf. Mt. 21.23; Jn.7.15; and for the similar position of the disciples: Ac. 4.13.

(3) Is.48.1-8.

(4) Is.54.13.

(5) Is.59.21; cf. Joel 1.2f.

(6) Jer. 18.18; cf. Lev. 10.11.

(7) Mal.2.7.

Conclusion

In this section is found the fullest and richest expression so far of the thesis already outlined and illustrated. The testimony referred to is the traditional basic teaching ("the old paths and the good way" of Jer. 6.16) about the nature of God, his demand upon men, his redemptive action in the world and his judgement on the righteous and the unrighteous. Much has been made by scholars of the juridical aspect of Is 43,44 and its reference to God's great law-suit with the false gods but it is necessary to keep in mind that the evidence for and against in this action can never be simply that of the eye-and-ear-witness. Certainly actual events are involved but the evidence adduced is fundamentally a statement of faith in the truth in and behind these events. The heathen were just as certain as the Jews of the historicity of the events, say of the Exodus and the seizing of Canaan; what was in question was the nature, character and will of the deity who was ultimately responsible for these events. Jacob and Israel are God's witnesses chosen by him that they may know and believe(!) and understand that God is (ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι) (Is. 43.10); they have been preserved by him that they may tell forth the glory of the God who speaks righteousness and proclaims truth (Is. 45.19). The subject of the testifying of the exilic and post-exilic prophets is according to the pattern of the Mosaic torah or μαρτύριον with its fourfold emphasis. The witnesses have no authority apart from their bare claim to speak the word of the Lord and this claim depends for its authority on the work of the Holy Spirit on the mind of the hearer. Failure to acknowledge the authority of the testimony is due to men following their own reasoning (ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτῶν . Heb: עַל־לֵבָבָם לָמַדְוּ (Ezek. 13.3)). These prophets were men who had a teaching authority conferred upon them by God himself, directly, as in the

case of Amos who found no sympathiser among the official guardians of the testimony, or through the priestly office as was the case with Ezekiel who remained faithful to his official obligation to guard and teach the original, authentic message of God and who was aware that his authority as a preacher of God's word stemmed from this word and not from his official position.

In Isaiah there is found the developed conception of the coming One, the Messiah who is known variously as the servant or son of God, the people's witness and leader who comes with the gospel of peace and the announcement of the kingdom of God: "Thy God reigneth"! ⁽¹⁾ to suffer vicariously, ⁽²⁾ to justify many by his knowledge, ⁽³⁾ to teach the children of Israel. ⁽⁴⁾ He is Zion's righteousness and her salvation; ⁽⁵⁾ he himself is the covenant of the people and a light of the Gentiles; ⁽⁶⁾ God has given him as a *παρυσέειον* to the people, that is to say, the Messiah is himself the authority whom God will give, he himself is the testimony, in the fulness of its content. He himself is the Word made flesh.

(1) Is.52.7.

(2) Is.53.5.

(3) Is.53.11.

(4) Is.54.13. This is necessary for Israel-Jacob; God's *παῖς* or *δοῦλος* is sometimes blind and deaf (Is 42.19-21) and in prison (42.22).

(5) Is.62.1.

(6) Is.42.6.

(9) JUDITH, SUSANNAH AND I AND II MACCABEESThe Nature of the Testimony

There is only one instance of the μάρτυς-group in Judith, viz. 7.28 where the author reports the Jews as saying to Ozias that they take heaven and earth and God to witness (μαρτύρεσθαι) against him if he does not do as they say. The History of Susannah is a complete illustration of the function of the witness for the prosecution in the OT legal sense, of the value and necessity of cross-witness examination, of the abhorrence in which the false witness was held and of the punishment meted out to him. The μάρτυς-group occurs in Sus 21 (Θ) (καταμαρτυρεῖν), 41 (μαρτυρεῖν), 43 (Θ) (καταμαρτυρεῖν), 49 (Θ) (καταμαρτυρεῖν) and 61 (ψευδομαρτυρῶ).

There is one verse in I Macc. where the Jews call on heaven and earth to testify (μαρτυρεῖν) against Antiochus' officers that they had put them to death without trial (2.37) and in II Macc. 12.30 the Jews testify to the goodwill shown to them by the Scythopolitans. There are, however, three other passages where words of the μάρτυς-group are used in a prophetic, didactic sense. When in I Macc. 2.56 it is written that Χαλεβ ἐν τῷ μαρτύρασθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἔλαβεν γῆς κληρονομίαν it is clear that μαρτυρεῖν is used here in the sense of teaching or reminding Israel of God's power, his law, his past mighty acts and his promises.⁽¹⁾ In II Macc. 3.31-39

(1) Cf. Nu. 13 and 14. Günther: Μάρτυς, p. 81: "Sein (Kalebs) 'Bezeugen' ist genau dasselbe, wie bei den Propheten zb. Neh. 11.26 - sogar die parännetische Bedeutungsnuancierung fehlt hier nicht - , und er selbst steht als eine Grösse biblischer Vergangenheit im Range eines Propheten." Caleb warned the people against apostasy. (NOLLS)

Heliodorus, urged to proclaim abroad to all men the sovereign majesty of God, testified (ἐξημαρτύρει) to all men the deeds of the supreme God which he had seen with his own eyes (v. 36), - an act of an obviously confessional nature. The author of this book also refers to the Song of Moses testifying (ἀντιμαρτυρούσης) in face of the torturers of the seven brothers that God will be entreated for his servants (7.6).⁽¹⁾ Caleb's testifying is parallel to Abraham's being found faithful in temptation, Joseph's keeping of the commandment, Phinehas' being zealous (presumably for the torah; cf. v. 58 and II Macc. 4.2), Joshua's fulfilling the word, David's and Elijah's being zealous for the law (I Macc. 2.52-58), all of which shows the close connection between testimony and torah and this is confirmed by the reference to the Song of Moses (II Macc. 7.6). The incident of the healing of Heliodorus shows that testifying can mean the interpreting of the natural in terms of the spiritual, the representing of the historical as being the action of God. Heliodorus tells the king that "the Place (the Temple) is really haunted by some power of God. He who dwells in heaven has his eye upon (ἐνόντης ἐστίν) that place and defends it, smiting and destroying those who approach it for ill ends." (II Macc. 3.38f).

The Content of the Testimony

In the story of the martyrdom of the seven brothers their spokesman asks the king: "What wouldst thou ask and learn of us?" and then he and his brothers and his mother proceed to testify⁽²⁾ (a) of the LORD God who is the king and creator of

(1) Charles' note (A and P. p.141): "A sententious description.....the testimony was borne against faithless Israel." misses the whole point, viz. that the content of the testimony is partly a kind of comfort, the promise of God that he will comfort his people (Dt. 32.36, 43).

(2) Cf. IV. Macc. 12.16. (A).

the world (II Macc.7.9,23,28), who has sovereign power (7.17), the almighty God who sees all (7.35) and who is alone God (7.37). (b) They are prepared to die sooner than transgress the laws of their fathers (7.2) which are God's laws (7.9), given by Moses (7.30). (c) They speak also of the compassion which God has on his servants (7.6), and (d) of the hope of eternal blessedness which they have (7.9,11, 23,29,33,36) and of the doom which the king is bringing upon himself (7.14,17, 19,31,35). Judas Maccabaeus gives a similar testimony in II Macc.8.18f,21 when exhorting his army: "We rely upon the almighty God who can by a nod lay low our enemies, aye and the whole world." Then he rehearses before them the aid repeatedly given in the days of their ancestors.....with these words he inspired them and got them ready to die for the laws.

The Authority of the Witnesses

I Macc.2.49-70 gives a report of the death-bed speech of Mattathias the priest to his sons, the Maccabaeans. In this he exhorts them to be zealous for the law and to give their life for the covenant of their fathers and he promises them honour and an everlasting name if they do this. He quotes the example of the heroes or witnesses of old all of whom were found faithful to the covenant, were zealous for and kept the commandment, fulfilled the word, bore witness. All that the Maccabaeans are called on to do is on behalf of the testimony; their authority as the sons of a priest and leaders of the people stems from their adherence to the torah and their authority is recognised only by those who observe the law.

The Authority of the Testimony

The testimony or covenant is authoritative because it is a gift of God. This is stated explicitly in II Macc.6.23 where the behaviour of Eleazar, one of the principal scribes, is described as being worthy τῆς ἁγίας καὶ θεοκτίστου νομοθεσίας .

The Transmission of the Testimony

Preservation of the testimony rather than its transmission is the main theme of I and II Maccabees which show the endeavours of those to whom the torah has been entrusted to ensure that it is obeyed. It is made clear throughout that it is an unthinkable thing to fall away from the religion of the fathers and that martyrdom is preferable to betraying the testimony.

Conclusion.

From the above it may be concluded that the authority of the Maccabaeen witnesses is a spiritual authority grounded in the torah or testimony which they teach and for which they die. Strathmann objects to the tracing of the development of the NT *μάρτυς*-concept being brought into close connection with the Maccabaeen martyr stories⁽¹⁾ but against this it must be held that the Jews cannot have enjoyed torture and dying any more than other people; their chief concern was not that they should die for the sake of the law but rather that the law should be upheld even though they should have to die.⁽²⁾ In the same way the Christian witnesses were not in the first place martyrs but proclaimers of God's testimony. The Maccabaeen martyrs are simply a link in the long chain of witnesses who bear the testimony of God.

(1) KWB, IV 489ff.

(2) This is movingly expressed by the three heroes in Dan. 3.16-18.

CHAPTER III

THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF THE OLD TESTAMENTThe Nature of the Testimony

The word-group is used for witness of fact in comparatively few instances in the Pseudepigrapha. The Book of Jubilees makes reference to the Heap of Witness, to the covenant between Jacob and Laban,⁽¹⁾ the evil spirits at the time of the Flood are said to be witnesses of their sons' destruction⁽²⁾ and in The Sibylline Books God is the Most High who knows, who looks on all, who witnesses all.⁽³⁾ The largest number of cases is in The Book of Enoch where it is said that the unrighteous will witness the victory of the righteous,⁽⁴⁾ that God uses men's evil deeds as testimony against them,⁽⁵⁾ that the prayer of the righteous will be a testimony against the unrighteous in the day of judgement,⁽⁶⁾ that the fact that the riches of sinners make them appear like the righteous but their hearts convict them will be a testimony against them for a memorial of their evil deeds⁽⁷⁾ and that God will summon every cloud and mist and dew and rain to testify against sinners.⁽⁸⁾ The Lord is witness, and His angels are witnesses, and Levi's sons and Levi himself are witnesses of the covenant which the sons make to walk according to God's Law.⁽⁹⁾ The Book of Enoch also warns the lying witness.⁽¹⁰⁾

(1) Jub. 29.8.

(2) ib. 5.10.

(3) Syb. Bks. (1).4.

(4) Jub. 50.2.

(5) ib. 89.63; cf. 89.76.

(6) Jub. 97.3f; cf. 99.3.

(7) ib. 96.4.

(8) ib. 100.11.

(9) T. Lev. 19.1-4.

(10) I Enoch 95.6.

In The Book of Jubilees the idea of testimony occurs very frequently and is linked closely with the Law; ⁽¹⁾ it is something which is to be commanded and taught; ⁽²⁾ it will serve as a reminder to Israel when they forget God and fall away from him. ⁽³⁾ But this Law is not confined to the basic, ethical requirement and is concerned with new moons and Sabbaths, ⁽⁴⁾ festivals and jubilees and ordinances, foods and fruits and childbirth, mixed marriages and injury to a brother; ⁽⁵⁾ it also has as part of its content all that is subsequently told (supposedly) to Moses. ⁽⁶⁾ The heavenly tablets have been given lest Israel forget, and God testifies to Moses that Moses may testify to Israel. The Book of Psalms, or at any rate Psalm 90, is designated 'the testimony of the heavens'. ⁽⁷⁾ Enoch, the scribe of righteousness, ⁽⁸⁾ is said to have been the first to write a testimony which he testified to the sons of men; ⁽⁹⁾ he also testified to the watchers, the angels who had sinned with the daughters of men. ⁽¹⁰⁾ Enoch's office was ordained for a testimony to the generations of the world, so that he should recount all the deeds of generation unto generation till the day of judgement. ⁽¹¹⁾

(1) Jub. Prologue; 1.4,12; 9.39.

(2) ib. 1.1,4.

(3) ib. 1.5.

(4) ib. 1.14; 2.24; cf. 2.33; 4.18; 6.37.

(5) ib. 7.31,39; 3.14; 6.12,23; 16.28f; 30.17; 36.11.

(6) ib. 1.26,29.

(7) Jub. 4.30.

(8) I Enoch 15.1.

(9) Jub. 4.18f.,24: "This vision is that of I Enoch 83-90."

(R. H. Charles, A. and P. note id. loc., p. 18).

(10) Jub. 4.22.

(11) ib. 10.17.

The Book of Enoch, itself described as a testimony,⁽¹⁾ provides further synonyms for the testimony which is described variously as a parable,⁽²⁾ teaching,⁽³⁾ wisdom,⁽⁴⁾ the paths of the Most High⁽⁵⁾ and a memorial.⁽⁶⁾

In The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs Reuben calls the God of heaven to testify (ἐπιμαρτυρεῖσθαι) to his sons that they walk not in the sins of youth, etc;⁽⁷⁾ presumably the word here means to instruct in righteousness. Levi distinguishes between the Law which was given to lighten every man, the law and the prophets⁽⁸⁾ and commands which are contrary to the ordinances of God,⁽⁹⁾ between the light and the darkness, the law of the Lord and the works of Beliar.⁽¹⁰⁾ There is also a very interesting command in the Testament of Dan: "The things which ye have heard from your father, do ye also impart to your children.....for he is true and long-suffering, meek and lowly, and teacheth by his works the Law of God."⁽¹¹⁾

-
- (1) I Enoch 104.11.
 - (2) ib.1.2.
 - (3) ib.81.5f.
 - (4) ib.82.2.
 - (5) ib.99.10.
 - (6) ib.96.4.
 - (7) T.Rueb.1.6.
 - (8) T.Lev.16.2.
 - (9) ib.14.4; cf. T.Ash.7.5.
 - (10) T.Lev.19.1; cf. II Cor.6.14f.
 - (11) T.Dan.6.9; cf. Jn.10.25.

The author of The Assumption of Moses describes it "as the Testament of Moses, even the things which he commanded.....
 ...in the prophecy that was made by Moses in the Book of Deuteronomy⁽¹⁾" and Joshua is described as the servant of the people and of the tabernacle of testimony.⁽²⁾ It is clear from another passage in this book that calling God and heaven to witness to someone means to ask God to remind that person: -
 "Then they shall remember me, saying in that day (when Israel is carried into exile).....'Is not this that which Moses did then declare unto us in prophecies and assuredly called heaven and earth to witness to us, that we should not transgress his commandments, in the which he was a mediator unto us '"⁽³⁾

Because he is grieved over Jerusalem Baruch shall be preserved that he may be for a testimony, that is a reminder of God's word by instructing Israel.⁽⁴⁾ Also in this apocalypse it is explained that Moses calls heaven and earth to witness to Israel, that is, to teach them "for he knew that his time was short but that heaven and earth endure always."⁽⁵⁾

(1) Ass. of Mos. 1.1-5.

(2) cf. Sir. 46.1. Charles' note (A. and B., p. 414) on this verse 7 does not do justice to the fact that the significance and importance of the tabernacle are due entirely to its contents. The note is indirectly correct insofar as the testimony is the medium through which succeeding generations are confronted by the revelation of God.

(3) Ass. Mos. 3.10-12; cf. II Baruch 19.1; 84.2 and 81.4,7 where Baruch says: "The Mighty One hath commanded me to instruct youmoreover let this epistle be for a testimony between me and you, that ye may remember the commandments of the Mighty One."

(4) II Baruch 13.3; cf. 31.3; "Hear, O Israel, and I will speak to thee, and give ear, O seed of Jacob, and I will instruct thee." 46.6; 76.4; 84.1-5.

(5) II Bar. 19.1f.

In spite of this Israel sins and transgresses "though they knew they had the law reproving them and the light in which nothing could err, also the spheres which testify,⁽¹⁾ and Me."⁽²⁾ Baruch's epistle is itself a testimony between him and his readers to remind them of the commandments of the Mighty One⁽³⁾ which have always been before men for in one of his visions the seer is told about the fountain of Abraham and his descendants "Because at that time the unwritten law was named among them, and the works of the commandments were fulfilled, and belief in the coming judgement was then generated, and hope of the world that was to be renewed was built up, and the promise of the life that should come hereafter was implanted."⁽⁴⁾

In IV Ezra the third joy to be experienced after death by those who have kept the ways of the Most High is that "they see the witness that their fashioner attests concerning them, that while they were alive they faithfully observed the law which was given to them".⁽⁵⁾ The writer of The Psalms of Solomon affirms that God is merciful to His servants whom he chastises.

Ἡ γὰρ πατρὴς ἐν νόμῳ διαθήκης αἰωνίου ἡ πατρὴς

(1) Cf. I Enoch 2.1: "Observe....the luminaries which are in heaven how they all....transgress not against their appointed order."

(2) II Bar. 19.3.

(3) II Bar. 84.7; cf. 85.6.

(4) II Bar. 57.1f.

(5) IV Ezra 7.94; cf. Jub. 30.17, 19; 31.32.

κυρίου ἐπὶ ὁδοὺς ἀνθρώπων ἐν ἐπισκοπῇ (10.4), which presumably means simply that this truth is taught in the scriptures.

The last of the seven brothers is reported by the author of IV Maccabees as saying: Οὐκ ἀπαυτομολῶ τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου μαρτυρίας ⁽¹⁾ and their mother equates διαμαρτυρία and νόμος in her exhortation: ὦ παῖδες, γενναῖος ὁ ἀγὼν, ἐφ' ὃν κληθέντες ὑπὲρ τῆς διαμαρτυρίας τοῦ ἔθνους ἐναγωνίσασθε προθύμως ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρῷου νόμου ⁽²⁾. This testifying is elsewhere described as 'obedience to the law of Moses', ⁽³⁾ 'a holy war

(1) IV Macc.12.16 (Cod.A reading). Strathmann (KWB.IV, p.484f) mentions this passage as the one exception lying outside the framework of the usual OT usage of the word-group. He follows Swete in accepting the A reading μαρτυρίας and adds a footnote: "Das μαρτυρία in 4 Makk.12.16 (A) wird eine aus späterem kirchl. Empfinden zu verstehende Variante sein." It is strange, however, that there is no alternative reading for διαμαρτυρίας in 16.16. A. Dupont-Sommer comments: "Il est fort intéressant de rencontrer dans notre panégyrique le mot μαρτυρία pris dans le sens de témoignage de la foi, et de témoignage par le sang." (Le Quatrième Livre des Macchabées, p.132. Against this is the correct view of R. Asting (Verkündigung, p.573) "Das 'Zeugnis' ist nicht gleichbedeutend mit der Tod, aber der Tod ist die Folge davon." The rendering of this verse (12.17) in Kautzsch (Apokryphen usw. II. p.167) is not a translation but a paraphrase which without any justification transfers the emphasis from the testimony to the testifying: "Deshalb will ich, fuhr er fort, dem Tode zwar ins Auge blickend, der Sache nicht abtrünnig werden, für die meine Brüder Zeugnis abgelegt haben." For the brothers and those who honoured them the important factor is the honour of God not their death. Surkau (Martyrien in jüdischer und frühchristlicher Zeit, p.136) correctly regards the brothers as witnesses in the sense of Is.43,44. but fails to see that it is not a question of the martyrs bearing testimony to or for the law by their heroism but rather of the martyrs proclaiming the testimony of God.

(2) 1b.16.16.

(3) 1b.9.2,15.

for righteousness', ⁽¹⁾ upholding the teachings, ⁽²⁾ suffering on account of divine teaching and virtue, ⁽³⁾ faithfulness to the law, ⁽⁴⁾ fulfilling righteousness ($\epsilonὐσεβεία$) ⁽⁵⁾ and taking part in an athletic contest. ⁽⁶⁾ No Jew would think of this as anything other than bearing God's testimony. ⁽⁷⁾

(1) 1b. 9.24; 16.14.

(2) IV Macc. 10.2.

(3) IV Macc. 10.10.

(4) IV Macc. 11.12.

(5) IV Macc. 12.14; cf. 17.20-22: "And these men, therefore, having sanctified themselves for God's sake, not only have received this honour, but also the honour that through them....our country was purified, they having as it were become a ransom for our nation's sin; and through the blood of these righteous men and the propitiation of their death, the divine Providence delivered Israel." : cf. also Mt. 3.15.

(6) IV Macc. 17.11-17; cf. 6.10; 15.29.

(7) In view of this it is difficult to understand Strathmann's conclusion (KWB. IV, p.491.12ff) that in the Jewish martyr-picture there is no thought of someone being witnessed to since the suffering and the dying for the law is the pious work par excellence. But the martyrs were not concerned to die, they were concerned that the testimony of God should be proclaimed and it is clear from the accounts of their martyrdom that they did proclaim this testimony and so bore witness to God, his law, his work and his promise. Michel (Prophet und Märtyrer, pp.20f) represents the view that the death is the testimony: "Immer erscheint der Märtyrer als der Vertreter der Sache Gottes in einer Konfliktsache, als Zeuge einer Wahrheit in der die Weltmacht zerbricht. Sein Tod ist schon selbst Zeugnis." This view must be rejected in the light of the OT conception of the testimony of God.

The Content of the Testimony

Sections 83-90 of I Enoch, whose complete book is described in Jubilees as a testimony,⁽¹⁾ outline briefly the course of Israel's history and the fourfold pattern of the testimony is evident. (a) God is the creator, the Lord of the whole creation of the heavens, King of kings and God of the whole world.⁽²⁾ (b) He is the Lord of judgement⁽³⁾ who judges the sin of the earth⁽⁴⁾ and who has taught his sheep, Israel, the way⁽⁵⁾. (c) God's redemptive action in the events of the Exodus is outlined⁽⁶⁾ and finally (d) there are described visions of the judgement,⁽⁷⁾ the new Jerusalem⁽⁸⁾, the conversion of the Gentiles,⁽⁹⁾ the resurrection of the righteous⁽¹⁰⁾ and the rule of the Messiah.⁽¹¹⁾

The Book of Jubilees is written on similar lines: God is the creator and sovereign of all⁽¹²⁾ who alone must be worshipped,⁽¹³⁾ the Holy God who judges all lawlessness⁽¹⁴⁾ but

-
- (1) Jub. 4.19.
 - (2) I Enoch 84.2; 89.30f.
 - (3) I Enoch 83.11.
 - (4) I Enoch 44.4.
 - (5) I Enoch 89.32.
 - (6) I Enoch 89.22ff.
 - (7) I Enoch 90.20-27.
 - (8) I Enoch 90.28f.
 - (9) I Enoch 90.30.
 - (10) I Enoch 90.33-36.
 - (11) I Enoch 90.37.
 - (12) Jub. 2.1-16; 7.36 etc.
 - (13) Jub. 12.1-4.
 - (14) Jub. 1.6; 5.2-4.

who is gracious to the remnant whom he saves for his purpose⁽¹⁾ and who makes wonderful promises for his people when they begin to study the laws and seek the commandments and return to the path of righteousness⁽²⁾ but who predicts judgement for the rebellious.⁽³⁾

In II Baruch the author's testimony also shows the four basic aspects of the teaching: the sovereignty of God whose name and glory are to all eternity,⁽⁴⁾ who is good and gives men the Law,⁽⁵⁾ who acts redemptively towards his people⁽⁶⁾ and who promises vengeance for his people and the consummation of his judgement,⁽⁷⁾ resurrection⁽⁸⁾ and the advent of the Messiah with all the glory of that time.⁽⁹⁾

In IV Ezra it is said that God is the creator⁽¹⁰⁾; his glory gave the Law to Jacob's seed;⁽¹¹⁾ he is gracious to his people, giving them the Land for an inheritance;⁽¹²⁾ he will bestow Messianic blessing when evil shall be blotted out and truth.....shall be made manifest⁽¹³⁾ and he foretells an

(1) Jub. 7.34; 23.31; 48.4,13-19.

(2) Jub. 1.7f, 15ff; 23.26-31.

(3) Jub. 23.18,22f. Günther (ZNW. 47 (1956), p.153) sees the content of the apocalyptic testimony as being confined to "die vor dem Gericht warnende Busspredigt."

(4) II Bar. 78.3; cf. 48.1-17.

(5) II Bar. 14.15; 15.5; 17.4.

(6) II Bar. 77.11; 85.2.

(7) II Bar. 24.1-4; 82.1f.

(8) II Bar. 30.2.

(9) II Bar. 72.1 - 74.4.

(10) IV Ezra 3.4f; 6.38-54.

(11) IV Ezra 3.19; 14.30.

(12) IV Ezra 14.31.

(13) IV Ezra 6.25-28; cf. 7.113-115.

imperishable hope.⁽¹⁾ The four-fold testimony is found in concise form in Ezra's last words: "Our fathers were at the beginning strangers in Egypt, and they were delivered from thence. And (then) they received the Law of life, which they kept not....Then was a land given you for an inheritance in the land of Sion, but ye.....have not kept the ways which the Most High commanded you...after death the names of the righteous shall be made manifest and the works of the godless declared."⁽²⁾

IV Maccabees also provides the now familiar pattern: The seven brothers worship the Creator of all⁽³⁾ and live according to his virtuous law.⁽⁴⁾ They have hope of salvation before God⁽⁵⁾ and bring forward a new aspect of his redemptive activity by asserting that their death on behalf of the Law will provide a vicarious atonement for the nation.⁽⁶⁾ The author states, finally, that "as many as with their whole heart make righteousness their first thought, these alone are able to master the weakness of the flesh, believing that unto God they die not, as our patriarchs...died not, but that they live unto God"⁽⁷⁾ and quotes the brothers as encouraging one another by saying: "After this our passion, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob shall receive us and all our forefathers shall praise us."⁽⁸⁾

(1) IV Ezra 7.120.

(2) IV Ezra 14.29-35.

(3) IV Macc. 11.5.

(4) IV Macc. 11.5.

(5) IV Macc. 11.7.

(6) IV Macc. 9.24; cf. 12.18 and T. Benj. 3.8: "In thee shall be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven (concerning the Lamb of God and the Saviour of the world) and that a blameless one shall be delivered up for lawless men and a sinless one shall die for ungodly men."

(7) IV Macc. 7.18-20.

(8) IV Macc. 13.17.

The Letter of Aristeas, written to vindicate the Jewish Law, although it uses none of the *μάερος* word-group, underlines the sovereignty of God - "Our Law-giver proved first of all that there is only one God and.....every place is filled with his sovereignty.....he made it clear that the power of God pervaded the whole Law⁽¹⁾ ...and...it is a foolish thing for people to make gods of men like themselves.⁽²⁾ And the people who have been separated are also characterised by the Law-giver as possessing the gift of memory.....wherefore he exhorts us... also in these words: 'Thou shalt surely remember the Lord that wrought those great and wonderful things.' "⁽³⁾

The Authority of the Witnesses

Those who testify are sent by God like the prophets⁽⁴⁾ and the Chasids⁽⁵⁾ or are shown everything by the angels of God like Enoch whose eyes were opened by God and who saw the vision of the Holy One in the heavens and heard everything,⁽⁶⁾ who was "an eye-witness of the wise and great and inconceivable and immutable realm of God Almighty⁽⁷⁾ and who says to his children: "And now, my children, I know all things for this is from the Lord's lips, and this my eyes have seen from beginning to end."⁽⁸⁾;

(1) Aristeas 132f.

(2) Aristeas 134-138.

(3) Aristeas 153-155.

(4) Cf. Günther (*Máeros*, p. 85): "Diese Visionen sind Enthüllungen", göttliche Offenbarungen; die spätjüdische

Apokalyptik setzt die Prophetie fort."

(5) Jub. 1.12; cf. II Bar. 84.7; I Enoch 89.51-53.

(6) Jub. 4.21; I Enoch 1.2; cf. 89.44, 54; 90.6; cf. Charles' note on I Enoch 89.44 (*A. and P.* II, p. 254): "The sheep whose eyes were opened, i.e. Samuel, who alone was seer when there had been no 'open' vision. Cf. I Sam 3.1, 21.", and on I Enoch 90.6, (ib., p. 257): " 'Began to open their eyes': rise of the Chasids..... The writer of these dream-visions was evidently a Chasid."

(7) II Enoch: Prologue.

(8) ib., 40.1.

they are commanded by God to testify like Noah⁽¹⁾ or, like the Teacher of Righteousness, they are raised by God to lead his people in the way of his heart.⁽²⁾

Isaac, in blessing Levi, says: "May the Lord give to thee and to thy seed greatness and great glory, and cause thee and thy seed, from among all flesh, (Even) as they (the angels and the holy ones) shall the seed of thy sons be for glory and greatness and holiness, and may he make them great to all ages. And they shall be judges and princes, and chiefs of all the seed of the sons of Jacob; they shall speak the word of the Lord in righteousness....and they shall declare My ways to Jacob and My paths to Israel,"⁽³⁾ thus showing the honour in which the teaching office was held by the author of Jubilees.

In IV Ezra the seer, just before his assumption, asks God not to destroy those that have lived like cattle but to regard "those that have gloriously taught the Law."⁽⁴⁾ He himself alone has been granted the revelation because he has applied his diligence to the things of God and searched out his Law.⁽⁵⁾

Enoch's testimony to his children is forthcoming because "The word calls me and the spirit is poured out upon me."⁽⁶⁾

(1) Jub. 7.31.

(2) Zad. Frag. 1.7. (= CD 1.11).

(3) Jub. 31.14f.

(4) IV Ezra 8.29; cf. Dan. 12.3; Mt. 5.14f.

(5) IV Ezra 13.53f.

(6) I Enoch 91.1.

This reference to the charismatic character of the testimony is amplified in IV Ezra where the seer wonders who will warn and admonish later generations "For the world lies in darkness and the dwellers therein are without light. For Thy Law is burnt; and so no man knows the things which have been done", and he proceeds: "If, then, I have found favour before Thee, send into me the Holy Spirit, that I may write all that has happened in the world since the beginning, even the things which were written in thy law, in order that men may be able to find the path, and that they who would live at the last may live." And he answered me and said ".....I will light the lamp of understanding in thy heart."⁽¹⁾

Another confirmation of the prophetic and spiritual character of the witness or teacher of the law is to be found in The Testament of Levi where reference is made to "a man who reneweth the law in the power of the Most High", who will be slain, just as all the righteous and godly have been persecuted and hated.⁽²⁾ There is also a messianic hymn in this work in which it is said: "Then shall the Lord raise up a new priest and to him all the words of the LORD shall be revealed;..... and his star shall arise in heaven as of a king lighting up the light of knowledge as the sun the day." There is in this passage a decided emphasis on the teaching authority of the coming Messiah who is not only prophet but also priest and king.⁽³⁾

(1) IV Ezra 14.20-26.
 (2) T. Levi 16.2f.
 (3) T. Levi 18.1-8.

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs holds the teaching office in very high esteem: "For everyone that knoweth the law of the Lord shall be honoured, and shall not be a stranger whithersoever he goeth. Yea, many friends shall he gain more than his parents, and many men shall desire to serve him, and to hear the law from his mouth.....Whosoever teaches noble things and does them, shall be enthroned with kings."⁽¹⁾ According to the author the teaching authority is vested in the Levitical priesthood: "For to Levi God gave the sovereignty. Therefore I command you to hearken to Levi, because he shall know the law of the Lord."⁽²⁾ "Obey Levi and Judah...for from them shall arise unto you the salvation of God. For the Lord shall raise up from Levi as it were a High-priest, and from Judah as it were a King, he shall save all (the Gentiles and) the race of Israel."⁽³⁾ In his vision Levi is told: "The light of knowledge shalt thou light up in Jacob.....and therefore there have been given to thee counsel and understanding that thou mightst instruct thy sons."⁽⁴⁾ Judah commands his sons: "Love Levi, that ye may abide, and exalt not yourselves against him, lest ye be utterly destroyed. For to me the Lord gave the kingdom, and to him the priesthood, and he set the kingdom beneath the priesthood. To me he gave the things upon the earth; to him the things in the heavens. As the heaven is higher than the earth, so is the priesthood of God higher than the earthly kingdom, unless it falls away through sin from the Lord and is dominated by the earthly kingdom."⁽⁵⁾ God's orders to his

-
- (1) T. Levi 13.3f, 9.
 (2) T. Levi 4.2-5.
 (3) T. Reub. 6.7f.
 (4) T. Sim. 7.1f.
 (5) T. Jud. 21.1-4.

children are: "Tell these things to your children that they honour Judah and Levi for from them shall the Lord raise up salvation to Israel."⁽¹⁾ Joseph enjoins his sons: "Honour Levi and Judah; for from them shall arise unto you one who saveth Israel."⁽²⁾

In The Assumption of Moses the leader says: "He designed and devised me, and he prepared me before the foundation of the world, that I should be the mediator of his covenant."⁽³⁾ and his authority as a teacher is further stressed by Joshua as "the sacred spirit who was worthy of the Lord.....the lord of the word, who was faithful in all things, God's chief prophet throughout the earth, the most perfect teacher in the world."⁽⁴⁾ Again, Moses is described in II Baruch as having been subject to God and thus he brought the Law to the seed of Jacob, and lighted a lamp for the nation of Israel.⁽⁵⁾ When Baruch is departing this life he gives the following instruction to his son and the elders of the people: "There shall not be wanting to Israel a wise man nor a son of the law to the race of Jacob. But only prepare your hearts, that ye may obey the law, and be subject to those who in fear are wise and understanding; and prepare your souls that ye may not depart from them. For if ye do these things, good tidings shall come unto you."⁽⁶⁾

-
- (1) T. Gad 8.1.
 - (2) T. Jos. 19.11f.
 - (3) Ass. Mos. 1.14.
 - (4) Ass. Mos. 11.16.
 - (5) II Bar. 17.4.
 - (6) II Bar. 46.4-6.

The Authority of the Testimony

The two tables of stone of the law and the commandment were given by God according to the author of The Book of Jubilees; ⁽¹⁾ the law and the testimony are taught by God, ⁽²⁾ declared by God. ⁽³⁾ In The Letter of Aristeeas it is said that the power of God pervades the whole law; even to think contrary to the law is to incur judgement. ⁽⁴⁾ The laws about months and sabbaths and feasts and jubilees ought not to be disturbed, so Moses is commanded to testify to Israel against the day when they are tempted to make any alteration. ⁽⁵⁾ Enoch's testimony will be a cause of joy and uprightness and much wisdom ⁽⁶⁾ and it is through the grace of God that the Gentiles will be multiplied in knowledge upon the earth and enlightened. ⁽⁷⁾

Baruch is asked by the people to write to the brethren in Babylon "an epistle of doctrine and a scroll of hope" (later described as a testimony) ⁽⁸⁾ for the shepherds of Israel have perished and the lamps which gave light are extinguished and the fountains have withheld their stream whence we used to drink....." and Baruch replies: "Shepherds and lamps and fountains come from the law: and though we depart, yet the law abideth. If therefore ye have respect to the law, and are intent upon wisdom, a lamp will not be wanting, and a shepherd will not fail, and a fountain will not dry up". ⁽⁹⁾

(1) Jub. 1.1; cf. IV Macc. 5.25.

(2) Jub. 1.4.

(3) ib. 1.7.

(4) Aristeeas 133.

(5) Jub. 6.37f.

(6) I Enoch 104.11f.

(7) T. Lev. 18.9.

(8) II Bar. 84.7; 85.6.

(9) II Bar. 77.13, 15f.

This conception of the law which endures for ever is repeated in IV Ezra: "Our fathers who received the Law observed it not, and the statutes they did not keep, and yet the fruit of the Law did not perish, nor could it - because it was thine; but they who received it perished, because they kept not that which was sown in them. Now it is a general rule that, when the ground has received seed, or the sea a ship, or any other vessel food or drink, and when it happens that what is sown, or what is launched, or the things that have been taken in come to an end, - these come to an end, while the receptacles remain: but with us it has not been so. We who have received the Law and sinned must perish.....: the Law, however, perishes not, but abides in its glory."⁽¹⁾ The authority of this Law is such that it may be accepted or rejected by those who hear it, as is clear from the above passage and many others, and the general impression is that it is usually rejected.⁽²⁾ The true and faithful witnesses, however, remain firm to the Law and are prepared to die for their testimony as Eleazar bluntly informs Antiochus: "We, O Antiochus, having accepted the divine Law as the Law of our country, do not believe any stronger necessity is laid upon us than that of our obedience to the Law."⁽³⁾

The Transmission of the Testimony

In the thought of Judaism the Torah or Testimony goes back to the foundation of the world and, indeed, Wisdom is God's partner and instrument in the creative act.⁽⁴⁾ According to Jubilees the law and the testimony concerning purification after

(1) IV Ezra. 9.32-37; cf. Mt. 13.3ff.
 (2) II Bar. 7.130.
 (3) IV Macc. 5.16f.
 (4) Prov. 8.22-30.

childbirth go back to the Garden of Eden⁽¹⁾ and the law and testimony of the Sabbath was given to the children of Israel as a law for ever unto their generations;⁽²⁾ Enoch placed his testimony on earth for all the children of men and for their generations;⁽³⁾ Noah says that he will give his sons commandments "as Enoch commanded his son in the first jubilees: whilst still living,...he commanded and testified to his son and to his son's sons until the day of his death."⁽⁴⁾ Moses is commanded: "Write down these words: for thus are they written and they record them on the heavenly tablets for a testimony for the generations for ever."⁽⁵⁾ After one of his visions Enoch is commanded by the seven holy ones: "Declare everything to thy son Methuselah, and show to all thy children that no flesh is righteous in the sight of the Lord, for He is their Creator. One year will we leave thee with thy son, till thou givest thy (last) commands, that thou mayest teach thy children and record (it) for them, and testify to all thy children."⁽⁶⁾ This he proceeds to do and in turn enjoins Methuselah to deliver the books to the generations of the world: "Preserve..the books from thy father's hand, and (see) that thou deliver them to the generations of the world. I have given wisdom to thee and to thy children...that they may give it to their children for generations...and those who understand it shall not sleep⁽⁷⁾.. and it shall please those that eat thereof better than good food."⁽⁸⁾

(1) Jub. 3.14.

(2) ib. 2.33.

(3) ib. 4.19.

(4) ib. 7.39.

(5) ib. 23.32.

(6) I Enoch 81.5f.

(7) Cf. Ro. 13.11; I Cor. 11.30.

(8) I Enoch 82.1-3, cf. Mt. 24.45; Lk. 9.13; Jn. 4.32 etc.

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs contains many allusions to this important factor of continuity: Simeon says: "I give you these commands that ye also may command your children;"⁽¹⁾ Levi says: "Isaac called me continually to put me in remembrance of the Law of the Lord, even as the angel of the Lord showed unto me. And he taught me the law....Now therefore observe whatsoever I command you; for whatsoever things I have heard from my fathers I have declared unto you.... And do ye also teach your children letters that they may have understanding all their life, reading unceasingly the law of God."⁽²⁾ The righteous and godly man is he who "reneweth the law in the power of the Most High."⁽³⁾ Dan says to his children: "The things which ye have heard from your father, do ye also impart to your children...for he teacheth by his works the law of God."⁽⁴⁾ Similarly, Gad,⁽⁵⁾ Asher⁽⁶⁾ and Benjamin⁽⁷⁾ are solicitous for the tradition.

In The Assumption of Moses, Moses says to Joshua: "Receive thou this writing that thou mayest know how to preserve the books which I shall deliver unto thee."⁽⁸⁾ and Ezra before he dies is commanded by God: "Set in order thy house and reprove thy people; comfort the lowly among them and instruct those that are wise."⁽⁹⁾ Some of Ezra's writings are to be published and some are to be delivered in secret to the wise.⁽¹⁰⁾

-
- (1) T. Sim. 7.3.
 (2) T. Lev. 9.6f; 10.1; 13.1f.
 (3) ib. 16.3.
 (4) T. Dan. 6.9.
 (5) T. Gad. 8.1.
 (6) T. Ash. 1.2; 7.4f.
 (7) T. Benj. 10.3-5.
 (8) Ass. Mos. 1.16.
 (9) IV Ezra 14.13.
 (10) ib. 14.26; cf. 14.5f., 45f.

Baruch, concerned for the preservation of the testimony, summons his first-born son, his friends 'the great men', and seven of the elders and says to them: "Withdraw ye not from the way of the Law, but guard and admonish the people which remain, lest they withdraw from the commandments of the Mighty One."⁽¹⁾ He adds that those who preserve the truth of the Law will be given the world to come,⁽²⁾ he continues with: "Do ye therefore, so far as ye are able, instruct the people, for that labour is ours. For if ye teach them ye will quicken them."⁽³⁾ and assures them that "there shall not be wanting to Israel a wise man nor a son of the Law to the race of Jacob."⁽⁴⁾ Baruch also instructs the brethren in Babylon: "Remember ye the Law and Zion, and the holy land and your brethren, and the covenant of your fathers, and forget not the festivals and the sabbaths. And deliver ye this epistle and the traditions of the Law to your sons after you, as also your fathers delivered them to you."⁽⁵⁾

In IV Maccabees the father of the seven martyrs is praised by their mother for he taught them the law and the prophets⁽⁶⁾ for he did not forget the song which Moses taught.⁽⁷⁾

-
- (1) II Bar. 44.1-3.
 - (2) ib. 44.14f.
 - (3) ib. 45.2.
 - (4) ib. 46.4.
 - (5) ib. 84.8f.
 - (6) IV Macc. 18.10.
 - (7) IV Macc. 18.18.

Conclusion

Those books of the Pseudepigrapha which introduce the idea of the witness give good grounds for defining the testimony as a form of teaching, indeed as the basic teaching of the OT in its broader or narrower aspect. It is a justifiable assumption that these books which influenced Jesus and the writers of the NT in so many other ways influenced him and his followers in this respect also.

The testimony has been shown to repeat the four principal ideas of the Mosaic torah and the men who bear it are prophets and visionaries. The witnesses are not dependent for their authority on any special official position, rather does their official position depend on their adherence to the testimony (Jub. 31.14f); those who have gloriously taught the Law (IV Ezra 8.29) are held in great esteem. The word spoken by the seer is a direct result of his call by the word and the pouring out upon him of the Spirit. Ezra confesses his need of the Holy Spirit before he can write his book of God's dealings with his people in the past and the things written in his torah and he is promised that the lamp of understanding will be lit in his own heart (IV Ezra 14.20-26).

"The Law and the Testimony are taught by God, declared by God" (Jub. 1.4,7); it is, in effect, the gift of God by his Holy Spirit and those who receive it and **transmit** it are in a true sense charismatics although what they teach is not a sudden ecstatic utterance but the traditional doctrine which abides for ever and has to be kept by those in whom it is sown (IV Ezra 9.32-37). This testimony or lore of God is something which may be accepted or rejected; it has no external sanction but depends on its own intrinsic appeal made evident by the work of the Holy Spirit in the mind of the hearer.

There is in the Pseudepigrapha a tremendous emphasis on the requirement that the testimony be made available "for the generations for ever." Enoch is commanded: "Preserve the books from thy father's hand, and (see) that thou deliver them to the generations of the world." (I Enoch 82.1-3). All the patriarchs, according to The Testaments, were solicitous for the tradition and Baruch says that to teach the people is to quicken them (II Bar. 45.2).

It is hard to believe that the teaching or testimony of Jesus whose concern for the law of God was so great (Mt. 5.18) and who regarded himself as greater than Moses and the prophets who mediated the $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ of the Song and preserved its teaching, should not have been preserved by his disciples 'for a testimony' similar in content but greater than that of Moses (Dt. 31.26), Enoch (Jub. 4.19) or Baruch (II Bar. 84.7; 85.6) since for the disciples, Jesus was himself the embodiment of the torah of God.

CHAPTER IVTHE MISHNAHThe Nature of the Testimony

As is to be expected in a book of legislation, the large majority of the references to testimony in the Mishnah are bound up with procedure. Various qualifications are demanded of the witness who must be of age⁽¹⁾ and be known to the judges.⁽²⁾ Father and son may be included together as a valid pair of witnesses in the ceremony of reporting the new moon⁽³⁾ and if one of them is disqualified for any reason, the other may be paired with someone else but in cases concerning property a kinsman is disqualified,⁽⁴⁾ as are also an enemy and a friend,⁽⁵⁾ (this latter being defined as a man's groomsman).⁽⁶⁾ Other persons disqualified as witnesses are dice-players,⁽⁶⁾ usurers, pigeon-flyers and traffickers in seven-year produce; in this respect, these are placed in the same category as women.⁽⁷⁾ No writ is valid which has a Samaritan as a witness.⁽⁸⁾ People are to be believed until their statements are disproved⁽⁹⁾ and the law extends to the death penalty for the abhorrent crime of false witness.⁽¹⁰⁾

(1) Ket. 2.10.

(2) R.H. 2.1.

(3) R.H. 1.7.

(4) Sanh. 3.4.

(5) Sanh. 3.5.

(6) See Str/Bill. on Eph. 4.14. (III p 599): "by the sleight of of men." κῶβια, κῶβεία = Würfenspiel, dann allgemeiner = Trügerei.

(7) R.H. 1.8; Sanh. 3.3ff.

(8) Except a writ of divorce or emancipation; cf. John 8.48 where Jesus is accused of being a Samaritan by those who will not accept his testimony.

(9) Gitt. 1.5.

(10) Sanh. 11.1,6.

An important aspect of this subject is found in those passages based on Deut. 17:6f; 19:15-19, which deal with the necessity of two or three witnesses appearing in any case.⁽¹⁾ Danby notes⁽²⁾ that by the form of expression 'two witnesses or three witnesses' Scripture indicates an infinite numerical series; the essential and constant element being 'witnesses' (i.e. not less than two). In this connection Makkoth states: "As the evidence of two witnesses is void if one of them is found to be a kinsman or ineligible so the evidence of three is void if one of them is found to be a kinsman or ineligible."⁽³⁾ Ideas such as these must have been uppermost in the minds of Jesus' opponents when they refused to accept his testimony; he himself relied on rulings like that of Ket. 2.9: "None may be believed when he testifies of himself."⁽⁴⁾ and that of Ket. 2.6f., which states that two people who testify a certain thing about themselves are not to be believed yet they may be believed if they give this testimony about each other. It was held that if a man took payment for bearing witness his testimony is void;⁽⁵⁾ and this may well have influenced Paul in the claim to have earned his own living which he makes in I Cor. 9 and also the authors of I and II Peter and Jude in the condemnation of the false apostles and teachers.⁽⁶⁾

(1) Makk. 1,1ff; Yeb. 3.8; Ket. 2.2; cf. Nu. 35.30; Mt. 18.16; Jn. 8.17; II Cor. 13.1.

(2) Danby, The Mishnah, p. 402, note 5.

(3) Makk. 1.8.

(4) This is the source, according to Str/Bill. (II. pp.466,522), for Jn. 5.31; 8.13; cf. R.H. 3.1.

(5) Aboth 4.5; Bek. 4.6.

(6) II Pet. 2.3,14f; Jude 11,16; cf. I Pet 5.2.

The legal testimony dealt with in the Mishnah is that of the ear- and eye-witness who can give evidence from personal experience and the authority of such testimony is, as has been previously noted, dependent on the trustworthiness of the witness and the efficacy of the safeguards against false witnesses; Sanhedrin 5.1-4 and Aboth 1.9 show that these safeguards were fairly secure. The Jewish insistence on the necessity of two or three witnesses left a definite impression on the documents of the early church which show that great care was taken in this respect.⁽¹⁾

The Tractate Eduyoth is so called because of the frequency of the expression: 'so-and-so testified'⁽²⁾ to some law or teaching, e.g., "R. Hanina the Prefect of the Priests testified concerning four things....."⁽³⁾ in Eduyoth 6.2 it is brought

(1) Sanh. 3.6; 4.5; R.H. 2.6-8. See Gerhardsson: Memory and Manuscript, passim.

(2) "The formula denotes a declaration made by a Rabbi in an official assembly of his colleagues of an authoritative decision which he had learnt from his masters." (The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I. Epstein (1935). Eduyoth. Introl. p.ix).

(3) While Gerhardsson is correct in pointing out (Memory and Manuscript, pp. 182f.) that the disciple had to learn all the traditional lore "by seeking the company of a Rabbi, by serving him, following him and imitating him and not only by listening to him and that the pupil is a witness to his teacher's words and actions" it is not so certain that he is right in saying (p. 183) that this testimony has as a rule 'a distinctly legal character', an 'eye-witness character' and that "the value of such sayings - for the Rabbis - is entirely dependent on their historicity." It must be acknowledged that the historicity concerns the hearing of the saying or the seeing of the action of the Rabbi concerned but whether the content of the testimony was true or not could not be determined by reference to the historicity of the tradition; there was very often disagreement between the sayings or testimony of different Rabbis.

out very clearly that to testify means to teach a traditional truth: "R. Joshua... testified that (the smallest) member of a corpse is unclean, concerning which R. Eliezer says: 'They have taught this only of a living being.'⁽¹⁾ Other expressions are used, e.g., 'to say',⁽²⁾ 'to speak',⁽³⁾ 'to give an opinion',⁽⁴⁾ 'to report opinions',⁽⁵⁾ all of which seem to be interchangeable.

The Content of the Testimony

The content of the testimony is a combination of the legal enactments of the Pentateuch (the written law), the traditions of the elders (the oral law) and an interpretation of this which attempted to apply the teaching to contemporary situations. There are two references to what are called 'The Yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven' and 'The Yoke of the Commandments',⁽⁶⁾ but no indication is given as to the nature of the difference between them. There is, in the Mishnah, a complete setting forth of that scrupulous, legalistic attitude to which Jesus was opposed, which was contrary to the spirit of the testimony of the Old Testament and Jesus' representation of it and which finally brought about his death.

(1) Eduy. 2.13; 6.1f; 7.1ff; 8.1ff.

(2) Eduy. 1.1 etc.

(3) Eduy. 1.3

(4) Eduy. 3.11.

(5) Eduy. 5.1

(6) Ber. 2.2; cf. Aboth 3.5. Danby's interpretation of the phrase 'the yoke of the kingdom' as 'the troubles suffered at the hands of those in power' is out of line with the thought of the 'yoke' as a form of teaching, e.g. Sir. 51.26: "Put your neck under the yoke and let your soul receive instruction."; Mt. 11.29f; Acts 15.10; Gal. 5.1. See below p. 135, note 4 for further rabbinic references for 'yoke' = 'torah'.

The Authority of the Witnesses

The Teachers or Sages who testify have authority by virtue of the fact that they adduce earlier testimonies; each one must remember that he is nothing in himself.⁽¹⁾ Knowledge of the Law is by study of it, not by inheritance,⁽²⁾ and he that occupies himself in the study of the Law shall be exalted.⁽³⁾ "He that learns from his fellow a single chapter or a single Halakah or a single verse or a single expression or even a single letter, must pay him honour"⁽⁴⁾ and one's teacher takes precedence over even one's father and mother.⁽⁵⁾ Rabbi Meir said: "He that occupies himself in the study of the Law for its own sake merits many things, and still more, he is deserving of the whole world.....And it gives him kingship and dominion and discernment in judgement; to him are revealed the secrets of the Law, and he is made like to a never-failing spring and like to a river that flows ever more mightily.....and it magnifies him and exalts him above all things." (Aboth 6.1). Rabbi Joshua ben Levi said: "Greater is (learning in) the Law than priesthood or kingship." (Aboth 6.6). Sanhedrin 11:3 sums up this attitude in the observation that "greater stringency applies to (the observance of) the words of the Scribes than to (the observance of) the words of the (written) Law. If a man said, 'There is no obligation to wear phylacteries so that he transgresses the words of the Law, he is not culpable; (but

(1) Aboth 3.1.

(2) Aboth 2.12, 14, 16.

(3) Aboth 6.2.

(4) Aboth 6.3.

(5) B.M. 2.11. "(If a man went to seek) his own lost property and that.....of his teacher, his own has first place; if that of his father and that of his teacher his teacher's has first place." Cf. Ker. 6.9.

if he said), 'There should be in them five partitions', so that he adds to the words of the Scribes, he is culpable." R. Eleazar rounded it off by saying: Let...⁽¹⁾.....the fear of thy teacher (be) as the fear of Heaven." This exaltation of the Scribe enabled R. Joshua to say that a decision of the Prophets has no precedence over a later decision of the elders.⁽²⁾

The Authority of the Testimony

In Peah 1:1 it is stated: "These are things whose fruits a man enjoys in this world while the capital is laid up for him in the world to come: honouring father and mother, deeds of loving-kindness, making peace between a man and his fellow; and the study of the Law is equal to it all;" this is because, as Hillel used to say, "The more study of the Law, the more life." Sanhedrin 10:1 lays it down that...." he that says that the Law is not from Heaven, and an Epicurean⁽³⁾ have no share in the world to come." So important is the Law that the king must write out a scroll of it for himself; when he goes forth to battle he shall take it forth with him, and when he returns he shall bring it back with him; when he sits in judgement it shall be with him, and when he sits at meat it shall be before him, for it is written, It shall be with him and he shall read therein all the days of his life.⁽⁴⁾ R. Hananiah said that "if two sit together and words of the Law (are spoken) between them, the

(1) Aboth 4.12.

(2) Yad. 4.3.

(3) "A frequent epithet applied both to Gentiles and Jews opposed to the rabbinical teachings." (Danby, Mishnah, p. 397, note 4).

(4) Sanh. 2.4.

Divine Presence (the Shekinah)⁽¹⁾ rests between them" and that "if even one sits and occupies himself in the Law, the Holy One, blessed is He, appoints him a reward" and R. Simeon said: "If three have eaten at one table and have spoken over it words of the Law, it is as if they had eaten from the table of God."⁽²⁾

All the Writings were regarded as holy⁽³⁾ and Judah the Patriarch said: "Be heedful of a light precept as of a weighty one",⁽⁴⁾ but the tradition is a fence around the Law⁽⁵⁾ and R. Eleazar of Modiim said: "If a man....discloses meanings in the Law (i.e. "those who ignore or dispute 'the traditions of the elders'")⁽⁶⁾ which are not according to the Halakah, even though a knowledge of the Law and good works are his, he has no share in the world to come."⁽⁷⁾ Another maxim was that the sword comes upon the world...because of them that teach the Law not according to the Halakah. Finally, when it is recalled that "greater stringency applies to (the observance of) the words of the Scribes than to (the observance of) the words of the (written) Law" it is clear that the Sages have rejected the ultimate authority of the four-fold testimony of Moses and the prophets of the Old Testament.

(1) Danby, p. 450, note 16. Delling (KWB. IV. p. 13.33-44) states: "Ist in den jüdischen Gelehrtschulen der Stoff das, was zuerst aneinander bindet....das παραλαμβάνειν vollzieht sich in einer Gemeinschaft, die nicht in der Persönlichkeit, sondern im Amt des Lehrers ihren tragenden Grund hat.....Durch den Unfehlbarkeitsanspruch der objektivierten Tradition wird auch das Verhältnis zwischen Lehrer und Schüler stark autoritativ."

(2) Aboth 3.2; cf. 3.6; Mt.18.20.

(3) Yad. 3.5.

(4) Aboth 2.1 cf. 4.2.

(5) Aboth 3.14.

(6) "The sense is: "those who ignore or dispute the 'traditions of the elders'. The offence is illustrated in Meg. 4.9." (Danby, p. 451, note 14).

(7) Aboth 3.12; cf. 5.8.

The Transmission of the Testimony

The Tractate Aboth 1.1ff. outlines the origin and history of the oral tradition, stating that "Moses received the Law⁽¹⁾ from Sinai and committed it to Joshua, and Joshua to the Elders,⁽²⁾ and the Elders to the Prophets;⁽³⁾ and the Prophets committed it to the men of the Great Synagogue. They said three things: Be deliberate in judgement, raise up many disciples,⁽⁴⁾ and make a fence around the Law." Then follows the long chain of tradition down to the beginning of the Christian era. It was claimed by Nahum the Scrivener that he had "received a tradition (about gleanings) from Rabbi Measha, who received it from his father, who received it from the Zugoth,⁽⁵⁾ who received it from the Prophets as a Halakah given to Moses from Sinai."⁽⁶⁾ This formula recurs in Eduy. 8.7 where Rabbi Joshua is quoted as saying. "I have received as a tradition from Rabban Johanan ben Zukkai who heard from his teacher, and his teacher from his teacher, as a Halakah given to Moses from Sinai." (cf. Yadaim 4.3).

(1) "The 'Oral Law' " (Danby, p. 446, note 2).

(2) Cf. Josh. 24.31.

(3) Danby illustrates by reference to Jer. 7.25 but Jeremiah's message was not a recall to anything like the programme of the Mishnah; it was on the contrary a recall to the original truths of the OT revealed to the patriarchs and Moses and Jeremiah's prophetic predecessors.

(4) "This can be fairly interpreted as involving the creation of a continuing teaching body". (J. Parkes, The Foundations of Judaism and Christianity (1960) p. 62).

(5) "President and vice-president of the Sanhedrin". (Danby, p. 12, note 3).

(6) Peah 2.6.

The Rabbis held in specially high honour those who faithfully preserved and handed on the tradition; Rabbi Johannan ben Zakkai praised his disciples, Eliezer ben Hyrcanus for being "a plastered cistern which loses not a drop" and Eleazar ben Arak for being "an ever-flowing spring." (Aboth 2.8). This teacher also forbade his disciples to claim merit for themselves from much working in the Law for this was the end for which they were created (ib. 2.8).

So closely were disciples expected to follow the instruction of their teacher that his exact words were used, at least in some cases.⁽¹⁾ For example, Rabbi Judah the Patriarch, the editor of the Mishnah, commenting on a ruling of Hillel concerning the amount of drawn water which renders the immersion pool unfit, excuses the use of the unusual term 'hin' instead of the usual 'three logs' on the grounds that "a man must use the manner of speaking of his teacher." (Eduy. 1.3). Two of the excellencies by which learning in the Law is acquired are by being one who learns in order to teach and by being one who retells exactly what he has heard and reports a thing in the name of him who said it (Aboth 6.6). It is hardly to be thought that Jesus, who was accorded the title Διδάσκαλος or Rabbi by the Pharisees should not be as insistent on the correct transmission of his teaching as the other teachers of his time or that his disciples would allow it to be distorted in any radical way.

(1) Gerhardsson (Memory and Manuscript, pp. 122-189) has shown that the oral tradition was carefully preserved although the rule that a man must use the manner of speaking of his teacher was followed when it dealt with "decisive doctrinal statements and basic textual material; the teacher's complementary sayings and his commentary, on the other hand, were presumably not impressed upon the memory with the same care for the exact wording." (pp. 131f.).

Conclusion

The idea of testimony in the Mishnah is necessarily a reflection of Jewish legalism on the whole but, in addition, the verb (719) is used to describe the activity of the links in the chain of the tradition of the elders; each teacher is an ear-witness of a pronouncement by a previous sage or by a generation or school of sages; "Rabbi Dosethai ben Yannai said in the name of R. Meir: "He that forgets one word of his study, the Scripture reckons it to him as though he was guilty against his own soul, for it is written, "Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the words thine eyes saw." (Aboth 3.9). It was the inhumanity of this tradition of the elders and the way in which it contradicted the spirit of the original truth revealed to Moses and stressed by the prophets which roused Jesus' opposition; he accused the Pharisees of transgressing the commandment of God by their tradition and of being blind leaders of the blind;⁽¹⁾ in the spirit and words of Isaiah he upbraided them for worshipping God in vain, rejecting the commandment of God and making it of none effect.⁽²⁾ Paul, as is evident in Galatians, was anxious to deny that his gospel depended for its authority on such a tradition but that he received it as revelation from Jesus Christ⁽³⁾ and in Colossians he contrasts 'receiving Christ' and 'the tradition of men'.⁽⁴⁾ No doubt the early church was influenced by the age-old and still-current Jewish method of handing down doctrine from teacher to teacher and

(1) Mt. 15.3,14.

(2) Mk. 7.7-13; cf. Mt. 16.12. He upbraids them, in fact, for substituting the tradition of men for the torah of God. See Branscomb (Jesus and the Law of Moses, pp. 41-44) for rabbinic evidence for this change.

(3) Gal. 1.11f.

(4) Col. 2.8,22.

there are many traces of this influence throughout the New Testament which will be noted later but the content of the New Testament testimony and the nature of its authority are vastly different; the testimony of the Mishnah is a chafing yoke and a grievous burden while the testimony of the church is the good news of the kingdom and love of God.

CHAPTER V.THE DEAD SEA SCROLLSThe Nature of the Testimony

The straightforward legal usage of the 719 word-group occurs in six places in those writings of the Dead Sea Sect which have been published so far, viz. 1Q79 in 1QS. 6.1; CD. 9.3, 17, 22f., 719 in CD. 10.1 and 719 in CD. 10.3. As might have been expected, there are many more occurrences of the group which denote the Torah of God, the teachers of it and their imparting of it.

The Scroll of the Rule contains a very important passage (1QS. 8.1-19) where it is stated that in the Council of the Community (there shall be) twelve men and three priests perfect in all that is revealed of the Torah,⁽¹⁾ to practice truth etc., to guard the faith upon earth.....While these men exist in Israel the congregation shall be established in

(1) Cf. Mt. 5.48: "Be ye perfect even as your Father in Heaven is perfect. Gaster notes (SDSS.p. 107, note 66) that this recalls the three pillars of the church in Gal. 2.9f. and also the twelve apostles but, as Reicke points out (The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. Stendahl, p. 151), it is not clear whether the three priests are inside or outside the circle of the twelve. Daniélou (La Communauté de Qumrân et l'organisation de l'Eglise ancienne, pp. 110-113) also sees a close analogy between the witnesses of the sect, whom he regards as 'hiérarchie strictement hiérarchisée', and those of the New Testament, but it is not at all proven that the Jerusalem apostles and elders were a hierarchy any more than were Paul and his circle of missionaries. Daniélou does, however, make the excellent point that institution and prophetism: priesthood and inspiration are not to be opposed to one another as von Campenhausen has advocated (KA. und GV., pp. 61-83). The true position, as stated in Mal. 2.7 is that the priest should keep knowledge and seek the law at God's mouth for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts and the prophet, at the same time, must always be given freedom to speak. A priest is such by virtue of his office and may be a prophet; a prophet is such by virtue of the word in his mouth and he may be a priest.

truth... they are the witnesses of truth for torah⁽¹⁾
 (למחשבה⁽³⁾ אמת⁽²⁾ נאמן). The Council are the elect, the
 expiators, the tried wall (as opposed to the false teachers
 who build the shaky wall) (CD. 4.19; 8.12f,18; cf. Ezek.
 13.10-16); they are the precious corner-stone....they are
 there to establish the covenant according to the everlasting
 precepts. This passage shows affinities with NT passages
 which are also related to Is. 43 and 44, eg. Jn. 5.33 where
 Jesus refers to John the Baptist as witnessing to the truth,
 Jn. 18.37 where Jesus claims that he himself came to bear
 witnesses to the truth and I Jn. 5.6 where the Spirit's func-
 tion is said to be testifying since the Spirit is the truth.

The Rule Annexe gives instruction concerning the educa-
 tion of native Israelite applicants for admission and their
 promotion to various offices. 1QSa,1-11f. is obscure but it
 must be admitted that the testimony referred to here is to be
 given by the young man concerned (with Gaster) rather than by
 the woman (with Dupont-Sommer) who is incidental to the

(1) Wernberg-Møller (The Manual of Discipline, p. 33 and p. 125,
 note 16) translates the phrase 'true witnesses about righteous-
 ness' and compares Prov. 14. 25,5 and Jer. 42.5. Vermès (Les
Manuscrits du Désert de Juda, p. 149. 8-11) translates: "Le
 conseil.... sera établi dans la vérité comme...une fondation
 ...des témoins de la vérité en vue de jugement." Brownlee
 (The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, p. 32f) translates: "The
 Council of the Community will have been established in truth
 ...as witnesses of truth concerning judgement" and draws
 attention to Is. 43.10,12; Jn. 5.33; 18.37. Dupont-Sommer
 (The Essene Writings from Qumran p. 91) translates: "They are
 the witnesses of truth unto Judgement and the chosen of Loving-
 kindness." Black (The Scrolls and Christian Origins, p. 128)
 connects these witnesses with Is. 43,10,12.

(2) אמת = faithfulness or truth and is applied to the word of
 God in Ps. 119.42 (Heb.), to prophecies in Jer. 26.15 (Heb.), to a
 servant of God in Is. 42.3 (Heb.) (Gesenius LXIII (4)).

(3) נאמן = נאמן in Is. 51.4; 42.1,3f. (Heb.).

teaching of the passage. The Hebrew וְכִי תִקְבַּל לְהַעֲדִיר עָלָיו חֻשְׁפִּטוֹת הַתּוֹרָה is translated by Gaster: "Furthermore it is only then (when he is twenty years old) that he is to be eligible to give testimony in matters involving the laws of the Torah."

The Damascus Document makes several references to testifying in the sense of teaching the Torah. In CD. 3.15 the testimony (עֵדוּת) is said to be revealed by God to the remnant; in CD. 8.14-17 (B 1.27-30) the writer quotes Dt. 7.8 and 9.5 and says that God will show to their successors the same love which he showed to the patriarchs⁽¹⁾ who testified, following him⁽²⁾ (בְּאַהֲבָת אֵל אֶת הַרְאִשִּׁים אֲשֶׁר תּוֹעִידוּ אַחֲרָיו CD. 8.16f.). In this case the witnesses are those who are faithful to the covenant and transmit it; they are opposed by "whoever despises the commandments of God and abandons them" (CD. 8.19). In CD. 8.54 (B 2.30f.) God's testimonies of truth (עֵדוּת אֱמֶת) are joined with precepts of holiness and ordinances of righteousness. The last reference in this document is CD. 15.14; Verses 13f. are fragmentary and obscure but it is fairly obvious that here תּוֹרַת הַיָּד is linked with "all that has been revealed of the torah of knowledge" and the work of the teaching priest.

The word תּוֹרָה appears twelve times in the Dead Sea Scrolls so far published,⁽³⁾ meaning simply 'command' or with a definite reference to the Torah.⁽⁴⁾ Of these the most

(1) Dupont-Sommer says (The Essene Writings from Qumran, p. 136, note 3) that these are the first disciples of the Teacher of Righteousness but אֲבוֹתָם = forefathers in Dt. 19.14 (Heb.).

(2) Cf. Prov. 28.23 (Heb.) where אַחֲרָי = following me, i.e. my precepts.

(3) 1QS. 1.9; 3.10, 16; 1QSa. 1.25; 1QH. 6.19; 12.9; 1QM. 2.8; 3.4; 11.8; 13.8; 14.4f., 13.

(4) Cf. Is. 8.16, 20 (Heb.) where it is linked with תּוֹרָה and LXX translates: μαρτύριον (Aq. and Sym.).

interesting are: 1QH.6.19, where the psalmist says: "They who have adhered to my testimony (תִּשְׁמְרוּנִי) have been led astray by the (false) inter(preters); 1QM. 11.7f: "And by the hand of Thine anointed (ie the prophets) who see the testimonies (תִּשְׁמְרוּנִי) Thou hast related to us the victories of Thy hand", 1QM 13.8 states: "And in all the testimonies (תִּשְׁמְרוּנִי) of Thy glory there will be a reminder of Thy (kingdom (Habermann), or grace (Dupont-Sommer), or covenant (Gaster))." This last instance confirms the thesis that the idea of reminding (according to the etymological meaning of תִּשְׁמְרוּנִי) was present to the mind of those who held to the covenant; finally, 1QM.14.4 reads: "Blessed be the God of Israel who remains faithful to His covenant and testimonies (תִּשְׁמְרוּנִי) of salvation with the people whom He has redeemed, which shows the close relationship between the covenant, the testimony and salvation.

The testimony has a rich variety of synonyms and synonymous phrases such as: 'what Moses commanded (1QS.1.2f; cf. 5.7-10), the precepts of God (1QS. 1.7; cf. CD. 1.20); God's truth (1QS.1.11; cf. CD. 8.54), his perfect ways and his counsel (1QS. 1.13), his words (1QS.1.14), everlasting knowledge (1QS.8.9), the teachings of knowledge (1QS.3.1), truth (1QS.8.6), wisdom (1QS.11.6), the well of living waters (CD.8.22), the Torah (CD. 8.51), the commands of the covenant (CD.8.52), God's ordinances (CD. 8.53). In an interpretation of Am. 5.26f and 9.11 the writer of the Damascus Document states in 7.15 that the books of the Torah are the tabernacle of David and in Florilegium the writer states that the tabernacle which has fallen (Am.9.11) is

he who will arise to save Israel⁽¹⁾ (4Q. Florilegium 1.12f.). Other interchangeable terms are, eg., the age-old way, the pattern of God's choosing (1QH.4.4) and the service of righteousness (1QH.6.19). The vision of knowledge is equated in 1QH. 4.17f. with the way of God's heart; testifying is seeing God's glory (1QH.10.20f) and telling forth that glory (1QH.13.1f, 11f.); prophets are men who have the vision of God (1QH.14.7); the covenant is founded on the vision of glory and is set, in the fashion of Hebrew poetic juxtaposition, alongside the words of God's Holy Spirit, the writing of God's right hand and the glorious teachings (1Q34.2.6f).

The Content of the Testimony

Although the content of the testimony or torah is never formally defined in the Dead Sea Scrolls nevertheless it is evident that it is the same as that of the OT. In the Scroll of the Rule 'the man of understanding' is given instruction that he may instruct and teach all the sons of light. The four-fold content of this instruction is to be discerned in 1.16 - 2.18 and 3.15 - 4.26. In the first of these sections (a) the priests are to recount the acts of God in all his deeds of power (1QS.1.21); (b) the Levites are to rehearse the iniquities of the children of Israel (1QS.1.22f); (c) the priests are to recite all God's tender mercies towards Israel (1QS.1.22); (d) reference to God's judgement is made in the blessings and cursing of the priests and levites (1QS.2.1-17). In the

(1) "The same function is attributed to the Branch of David in Jer. xxiii.6: 'In his days, Judah will be saved and Israel will dwell securely' (cf. Jer. xxxiii.16); cf. Lk. xxiv.21: 'We had hoped that he (Jesus) was the one to redeem Israel.....' " (Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, p. 313, note 4). One might also instance the many occasions when Jesus is designated 'Son of David': Mt. 9.27; 12.23; 15.22; 20.30f; 21.9; cf. Ac.15.16; Ro. 1.3.

second passage it is said (a) that from the God of knowledge comes all that is and shall be, everything fulfils its function according to his design (1QS.3.15-18), (b) he allots to man the spirits of truth and perversity (1QS.3.18f) and he loves the former everlastingly (1QS.3.26 and 4.1), (c) God and his angel of truth succour all the sons of light (1QS.3.24f.) and the judgement of God will bring blessedness to those who walk in the Spirit of truth and doom to others (1QS.4.11-14).

The writer of the Damascus Document calls on his disciples to hear him and he will uncover their eyes that they may see and that they may understand the works of God (CD.2.14f). (a) This God is the Creator (CD.2.21; 3.8), (b) who demands obedience to his ethical commands (CD. 2.15f,18,21). (c) God in his marvellous mysteries forgave their iniquity and blotted out their sin (CD. 3.18) and (d) those who cling to the community of the covenant are destined for everlasting life (CD.3.20).

The author of the Hymn Scroll speaks explicitly of his testimony (6.19) whose fourfold content is evident in the preceding lines and those which follow: (a) God is the God of glory (6.10,12), the creator (6.10), the most high God (6.19), (b) who has made known to men 'the way of his heart' (6.7f.), (c) who acts redemptively in history (5.20, 32f) and (d) whose judgement will be abundant mercy and pardon so that the men of his council will be his princes in the lo(t of light) while all the soul(s of darkness) shall be consumed (6.14,18). Another page in the Hymn Scroll gives a summary of God's teaching: (a) There is no God like Adonai (7.28) who is an everlasting God (7.31) and beside Whom there is nothing (7.32); (b) his face is against sin (7.30); (c) his marvellous deeds include pardon, goodness and mercy toward his sons (7.29f, 32); (d) before his judgement no men will be just (7.28f).

A third passage in this work is 11.3-14 where the psalmist outlines God's 'secret of truth': (a) God is a God of power and glory (11.6-8) and (b) of righteousness (11.7) who (c) also grants pardon and cleansing from sin (11.9) and (d) ensures the blessed future of the saints (11.12-14).

The Authority of the Witnesses

In these writings the shadowy figure of the Teacher of Righteousness or Right Teacher is given many titles from which it is evident that he is thought of as an authoritative, prophetic and priestly guardian, an interpreter and expositor of the torah, the witness who testifies the 'testimonies of truth'. Many conjectures have been advanced concerning his identity but none has met with universal approval; it may well be that this title refers to an office rather than an individual. Much is said in the Scroll of the Rule in connection with the witness, the man of understanding who is to instruct and teach the sons of light (3.13). The sons of Zadok, the priests, keep the covenant (5.2); they are the men to whom the torah of Moses is revealed (5.9). It is significant, however, that the majority of the members of the community who keep the covenant have authority alongside the priests (5.2f, 9f.). Wherever there are ten men in a congregation there is to be one priest who will study the law day and night but the others are also to share in non-stop study for a third of the nights of the year; the priest sits in the first place according to rank and there are differences of rank among the ordinary members as is evident from 2.23: "And no man shall go down from the place he must occupy, nor raise himself above the place to which his lot assigns him."⁽¹⁾ The overseer or inspector seems to

(1) Cf. 5.20-24; 1QSa.1.16-18.

have been another title for the priest for he controls the debate, interrogates the applicant for admission and instructs the volunteer who is to be admitted (6.10-16) and yet it is the whole community which gives the final decision (6.10-16; cf. Ac. 15.4,12,22f.). In the council of the community there are to be twelve men and three priests perfect in all that is revealed of all the torah.....to guard the faith on earth..... when these are in Israel the council of the community shall be established in truth as an everlasting planting.....they are the witnesses of truth, or faithful witnesses of the torah (1QS. 8.1-6).⁽¹⁾ It is clear that the authority of these witnesses or teachers is derived from the authority of the torah which they teach, indeed anyone who deviates from this doctrine is to be expelled (8.21-23). It is laid down that the sons of Aaron alone shall command in matters of divine law (אֲהַרֹנִים) (9.7) for the man of understanding (חָכָם) is 'the instructor, the guide, the catechist'⁽²⁾ who conceals the maxims of the torah from the men of perversity but keeps true knowledge and right justice for those who have chosen the way. He shall guide each man in knowledge according to his spirit....he shall instruct them in the marvellous and true mysteries (9.17f.). The instructor who receives his knowledge as a gift from God sings: "He has poured forth from the fount of his knowledge the light that enlightens me and my eye has beheld his marvels and the light of my heart pierces the mystery to come." (11.3f; cf. vv. 15-18).

(1) Gaster (The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, p. 65) translates. "The members of the community....will be the witnesses of God's truth" although he takes 8.10b-16 as applying to the fifteen (or twelve) so that it is they who are separated from the rest of the community as expositors of the torah who prepare the way by the study of it.

(2) Cf. Dupont-Sommer (op. cit. p. 95, note 1).

The Damascus Document states that God raised the right teacher to lead the remnant in the way of his heart (1.11f.) and that he raised out of Aaron men of understanding and out of Israel sages and he caused them to hear (his voice) and they dug the well which is the torah (6.2-4). This activity is to counteract the work of false prophecy. (6.1) and to these men God has made known his truth which was spoken by his anointed, i.e. the prophets (2.11-13).⁽¹⁾ In the instructions for the camp communities the priest or levite who is expert in the torah is the overseer who instructs the others but all are to obey the priest even though he in turn has to rely upon a levite for expert advice (13.1-7). The overseer is to instruct the community in the works of God and teach them his marvellous deeds, unloose their bonds and examine new members (13.7-11). It is to be noted that there is one overseer of all the camps who has mastered all the secrets of men and all the tongues which their various clans speak (14.8-10) and it is interesting also that every member of the sect is registered in his due status in the lot of truth (13.11f.).

In the Hymn Scroll the psalmist regards himself as the foundation of truth and understanding for those whose way is straight (2.10), an interpreter of knowledge concerning the marvellous mysteries (2.13) but it is God who has effected this by establishing the teaching by the psalmist's mouth and setting understanding within his heart that he might open the fountain of knowledge (2.17f.). The writer is opposed by the

(1) This is true also of the "right teacher" who explains all the words of his servants the prophets (1QpHab.2.8f.), who made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets (1QpHab.7.4f.) in contrast with the "wicked priest" who was called by the name of truth at the beginning of his coming but who abandoned God for the sake of riches. Cf. the NT dislike of teachers who trust in wealth.

interpreters of falsehood (2.31; 4.7) and seers of deceit (4.9f.), the men who are not firm in God's truth (4.14) and have said of the vision of knowledge: "It is not true" and of the way of God's heart: "That is not it." (4.17f.) The psalmist never tires of reiterating the fact that his position is due to the gift of God, called variously: his marvellous mysteries, his power, his counsel, the knowledge of his mighty works (4.27-29), the secret of truth (5.9), God's torah sealed up in the heart (5.11). The teacher leans on God's truth for it is God who will "set the foundation (of the house of truth) upon rock and the framework on the cord of righteousness (מַשְׁכָּל וְקֶדֶף) ⁽¹⁾....in order to build a stout bui(ld)i(ng) such as will not shake".(6.25-27) ⁽²⁾ The relationship of teacher to taught is that of a father or nurse to children (7.20-22; cf. I Thess. 2.7,11). That the authority of the sons of truth depends on their grasp of the testimony is twice stated explicitly in the Hymn Scroll, firstly, "And unto Thy sons of truth Thou hast given under standing and they shall know Thee for ever and ever (and) shall be glorified according to their knowledge. And likewise unto the son of ma(n....) Thou hast given an abundant portion of the knowledge of Thy truth and he shall be (gl)ori(fied) according to his knowledge." (10.27-29) ⁽³⁾; secondly, in the words of the Teacher: "And in proportion to (their knowledge... and) according to their understanding Thou

(1) קֶדֶף = literally, a rope or measuring cord, hence, metaphorically, rule or law as in Is. 28.10 where it means knowledge or teaching.

(2) Cf. Mt. 16.18 and the striking parallel of "the doors shall be so protected that none will be able to break them...and the ancient gates shall send out weapons of war (1QS.6.27f.,31).

(3) Cf. Jn. 17.1-3,22; Mt. 13.54; Lk.4.15.

hast made them draw near, and they shall serve Thee in conformity with their authority⁽¹⁾ according to the divisions (...)without transgressing Thy word." (12.22-24).⁽²⁾ No official position gives the Teacher the authority to proclaim his message; "God", he says, "is the source of the fountain in his mouth and he himself is dust, like those whom he teaches" (18.10-12); he continues: " (ho)w can I see unless Thou uncover my eyes?" (18.19).

According to the Commentary on Habbakuk the Teacher's words are from the mouth of God; that is, they are given on his authority (1QpHab.2.2f). The prophets, according to the War Scroll are 'those who see the testimonies' (1QM.11.7f.) and Israel (in this case surely the sect) is the people of the saints of the covenant and of those who are learned in the precept.....who hear the voice of the venerated (Being) and see the angels of holiness...those whose ear is opened and who hear profound things." (1QM.10.10f.) This congregation of Israel is to be obedient to the torah of the sons of Zadok, the priests (1QSa.1.1f).

(1) "The amount of authority exercised by the sectaries depended on the degree of their spiritual advancement, and their hierarchic rank on the excellence of their holiness." (Dupont-Sommer: op. cit. p. 240, note 2).

(2) Cf. 1QSa.1.16-18: "Whoever is destined to take his place in the offices.....according to his understanding and the perfection of his conduct, he shall strengthen his loins in the position (which he occupies) in order to fulfil the office confided to his care in the midst of his brethren. They shall all be honoured, one more than another, (according to whether they) have much or little."

The Authority of the Testimony

The testimony, which is the torah or truth or covenant of God, has certainly an authority but it is one which has no external sanction; it has its source not in an official position but in a revelation of God. The witnesses of 1QS 8.6 are men who are perfect in all that is revealed of all the torah (1QS.8.1); they are to act according to all that is revealed.... and according to that which the prophets have revealed by his Holy Spirit (1QS.8.15f.).

In the Damascus Document God's testimonies of righteousness are among the hidden things which he reveals to Israel (CD.3.13-15).

The writer of the Hymn Scroll describes as 'the people who participated in my testimony' (1QH.6.19) those whom God has taught according to (the words of) his mouth (CD.6.9). Those who see the testimonies are the anointed of God, that is, they are the prophets, the receivers of revelation, according to the War Scroll (1QM.11.7f.) and Israel has in these testimonies a constant reminder of God's grace (Dupont-Sommer) or covenant (Gaster) or kingdom (Habermann) (1QM.13.8f.), ⁽¹⁾ that the remnant....may recount his works of truth.

The writings of the Dead Sea Sect show repeatedly that the testimony is a grace-gift. The priest's blessing runs: "May he enlighten thy heart with understanding of life, and favour thee with everlasting knowledge (1QS.2.2f.)." The Scroll of the Rule insists that it is only through the spiritual apprehension of God's truth that a man's ways can be properly directed...only through the Holy Spirit can he achieve union with God's truth (1QS.3.6f.); when the twelve men and three

(1) The ms. is faulty here.

priests are carrying out their work of instruction the Holy Spirit will rest on a sound foundation and the truth will be evinced perpetually (1QS.9.3f.);⁽¹⁾ God has given to the elect the fountain of righteousness, the reservoir of power and the dwelling-place of glory as an everlasting possession (1QS.11.4-7) and the idea of the gift is repeated in vv.3, 15-18. It is for false teaching that the congregation of traitors is deposed (CD.1.12 - 2.1); they have defiled their Holy Spirit and spoken against the precepts of God. That the testimony is a gift of grace is noted again in the Hymn Scroll in 1QH.1.21; 2.17f.; 4.27f., 31f; 10.13f; 10.27-29; 11.16f. In 1QH.9.32 God's certain truth and his Holy Spirit are equated; in 1QH.12.11f. the writer says that, gifted with understanding, he has known God because of the Spirit he has put in him (cf. 13.8f; 14.12f.). The whole of this concept of the inspired teacher is summed up in 1QH.14.25: "Thou hast favoured me, Thy servant, with the Spirit of knowledge." Finally, in the Prayer of the Feast of Weeks, God's covenant is said to be founded on 'the vision of glory and the words of God's Holy Spirit, on the works of his hands and the writing of his right hand that his chosen people might know the glorious teachings (1Q34.2.6). The Sect clearly regarded their torah and their exegesis of it as inspired and prophetic, the latter representing the exact purport of the former. The Teacher is the man who seeks and finds the truth. Dupont-Sommer is not exaggerating when he says: "the collection of the sect's ordinances was (thus) endowed with an extraordinary prestige, like the Mosaic Law itself."⁽²⁾

(1) Cf. Jn. 4.21, 23f.

(2) Op. cit., p. 147.

The Tradition of the Testimony

In spite of the charismatic nature of the testimony the sect regarded it as having a settled and permanent character; it was something to which the member must adhere, in which he must stand firm; it was a doctrine which must not be altered and which must be preserved and passed on. This is evident from the following examples: "They shall make no single step from all the words of God concerning their times." (1QS.1.13-15); "They shall not depart from any maxim of the torah to walk in all the stubbornness of their heart." (1QS.9.9-11); "With wise reflexion I will recount⁽¹⁾ knowledge; with understanding prudence I will guard (it) within firm bounds to keep the faith and the law strictly according to the righteousness of God." (1QS.10.24f.). According to the Damascus Document all those who enter the community are to act according to the exact tenor of the Law in which the first had been instructed." (CD.4.8) and CD. 15.12f. runs: "And when once he has undertaken to be converted to the Law of Moses with all his heart and soul, (how) terrible would it be for him to be(t)ray (it)." The false interpreters and deceitful seers have bartered the Law for flattering words to the people of God and stop the thirsty from drinking the draught of knowledge (1QH.4.9-11) but the right teacher will not abandon any of God's precepts (1QH.15.12). The Law goes back even beyond Moses to the patriarchs (CD.3.2-4; 8.17f.). The deep, deep truth of God is something that can be set firm in the heart of the believer (1QH.5.9), something to which he can hold fast (1QH.7.20). The testimony is described as a measuring-cord and a plumb-

(1) Taking the variant 7208 instead of 7205; cf. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit. p. 47, note 2.

line (1QH.5.25f; cf. 18.10-12). The glorious testimonies of God are a perpetual reminder of God's grace in the midst of Israel (1QM.13.8) and it is stated that God's counsel will remain and the thought of his heart will stand fast for ever (1QH.4.13). The twelve laymen and three priests mentioned in QS.8.1 are there to guard the faith as witnesses (1QS.8.3; 10.24f.); the sons of Zadok, the priests, have been chosen by God to establish his covenant for(ever) (1QSb.3.22f.); all Israel is to be the keeper of God's testimonies (1QDM.2.8f.). The teacher is given the word to teach others, as is shown by 1QH.6.10-12: "And(Thou hast) created (me) for Thy sake to (ful)fil the Law, and (to te)a(ch by) my mouth the men of Thy councilthat Thy marvels may be told to everlasting generations... and all the nations shall know Thy truth and all the peoples Thy glory." The true teacher who is to pass on the doctrine as a father or a nurse feeds a child (1QH.7.19-22) must not be silent (1QH.10.14f.). The psalmist of the Hymn Scroll writes: "(And Thou hast created all) the host⁽¹⁾ endowed with knowledge to recount mighty deeds unto flesh and the true precepts unto him that is born (of woman)" (1QH.18.23f.).

(1) $\text{H} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{S}}$ is applied to the ministry of the priests in the tabernacle of testimony in Num. 4.23 (cf. 8.24; I K. 2.22); LXX translates; $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\upsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ καὶ ποιεῖν τὰ $\xi\epsilon\gamma\alpha$ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου. $\text{H} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{S}}$ also means to war a warfare; cf. I Tim. 1.18.

Conclusion

As far as the study of the Biblical testimony is concerned the Dead Sea Scrolls serve as an epilogue to the Old Testament rather than as a prologue to the New Testament; it is not until Jesus has come that the witness and the testimony become one, that the witness himself is the fulfilment and embodiment of the testimony. In the Scrolls the testimony is the traditional teaching about God in his relationship to man with its constant fourfold content. The witnesses are the leaders of the community and their authority is a prophetic teaching one which depends on adherence to the doctrine. The testimony is a grace-gift from the mouth of God himself but nevertheless it is a static thing with regard to its general principles and must not be altered in any way. The authority of the testimony is discerned by prophetic vision and has no external, official sanction. Great stress was laid by the sect on the faithful transmission of the testimony and permanent expulsion was the penalty for any teacher who deviated from the original.

PART IITHE NEW TESTAMENT

The close connection between the OT and the NT has always been recognised and the witness-concept provides no exception to this. In the NT the true meaning of the term is seen when it is thought of in connection with the root-meaning of 'reminding' and with the OT testimony or testimonies which are the prophetic teaching about God and his relationship to men. In the following chapter it will be seen that John the Baptist, while continuing the prophetic task of reviving the testimony and recalling God's people to it, introduces a new factor, viz. that he points to the man who is the embodiment of the testimony.

CHAPTER VI.THE PROPHETIC TESTIMONY OF JOHN THE BAPTISTThe Nature of the Testimony

It is only in the Fourth Gospel that the Baptist is explicitly stated to function as a witness: to the light: ^{ἦλθεν} εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός (1.7f.); ⁽¹⁾ to the Logos. Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ (ὁ Λόγος) (1.15); to the coming Lord: Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου μέσος ὑμῶν στήκει ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε (1.19,26); to Jesus' possession of the Spirit: Καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἰωάννης λέγων ὅτι Τεθέαμαι τὸ Πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ ἔμεινεν . (1.32); to Jesus as the Son of God. καὶ γὰρ

(1) The reference to the descent of the Spirit shows that John's 'seeing' is spiritual and his testimony is a spiritual judgement. He saw Jesus with the eye of flesh and the Son of God by faith. His testimony is therefore of the same order as that of Moses; cf. Kattenbusch: Der Märtyrertitel. ZNW. 4(1903), pp. 113f.

ἔώρακα, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ
 Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ (1.34; cf. 3.26); to the truth: ὑμεῖς
 ἀπεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. (5.33).
 There are, however, many passages in the Synoptics where John's
 activity is the same but is described in different terms,⁽¹⁾ viz.
 κηρύσσειν (Mt. 3.1f., par.)⁽²⁾ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι⁽³⁾ and
 παρακαλεῖν⁽⁴⁾ (Lk. 3.18) and 'coming ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης'
 (Mt. 21.32). Ὁμολογεῖν also is used by the author of the
 Fourth Gospel (1.20); these show that here the μάρτυς is the
 prophet of the truth of God which is Jesus.⁽⁵⁾

(1) Cf. Oepke, KWB. III.583.6ff; cf. also Dodd (The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p.330): "This testimony (that of John the Baptist) is certainly more explicit in the Fourth Gospel than in any of the others, but all of them point to its employment in the preaching of the Gospel."

(2) For the synonyms of κηρύσσειν, which include μαρτυρεῖν see Friedrich: KWB. III.702.5-11.

(3) Cf. Friedrich KWB. II.715. 31f.

(4) Cf. Schmitz (KWB. V.776.12-14): "Vor allem (in LXX) dient παρακαλεῖν u gelegentlich auch παράκλησις dazu, den göttlichen Trost zu verheissen u zu bezeugen, der dem Volke Gottes, das unter dem Gericht Gottes steht, u auch dem einzelnen der in der Anfechtung steht, gegeben werden soll." Cf. ib. 790.9-24; Schechter (Studies in Judaism p. 187): "The Bible, especially the books of the prophets consists, in great part, of promises for the future which the rabbis justly termed the 'Consolations'. Cf. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, pp. 119, 125.

(5) Bernard (ICC. p. 34) insists that the Baptist is an eye-witness; but his testimony does not mean much if he only saw a dove, and anything more than this is something more than eye-witnessing. B. also speaks (p.110) of "the profound conviction of the Apostolic Age that the Church's teaching rested on the testimony of eye-witnesses."

Bultmann (Das Evangelium des Johannes, p. 30, note 5) avers that throughout the Gospel μαρτυρεῖν (μαρτυρία, μάρτυς) have a juristic sense: "durch seine Aussage einen in Frage stehenden T a t b e s t a n d s als wirklich (bzw. unwirklich) bezeugen (cf. pp. 58f.) but this can scarcely be true of the testimony of the Spirit of truth who will testify of Jesus (15.26) or the testimony to the truth borne by Jesus (18.37). B. should have made it clear that the legalistic sense only applies metaphorically, in respect of the great trial between God and the world which he refers to on p. 426, note 5. and p. 507.

When the Content of the Baptist's Testimony is examined it becomes clear that in its main principles it is precisely that of the Mosaic torah and the prophets;⁽¹⁾ it is certainly not simply a set of observable facts⁽²⁾ but a body of doctrine concerning God, his nature, will, purposes and activity; in a word, its content is God's revelation.⁽³⁾ John has the distinction of being the first after many years of silence or of pseudonymous writing to come out into the open with a fearless proclamation of the word of God and, over and above that, he has the honour of being the fore-runner of him who is the Word.

(1) NB. Jesus' words: "All the prophets prophesied until John." (Mt. 11.3). and cf. Oepke (KWB. III.582. 42-44): "Das NT übernimmt den Ertrag der alt. lichen Offenbarung. Der Gott des NT ist der des AT, nicht im Sinne der Absoluten Identität der Gottesvorstellung, wohl aber im Sinne heilsgeschichtlicher Kontinuität. Von Campenhausen (Die Idee des Märtyriums in der alten Kirche, pp. 9f.) is correct in saying that the witness idea in the sense taken by the NT writers is rooted in the OT and it is difficult to see how the truth concerning the Law can be separated from the fidelity of the Christian witness to the truth about God as it is in Christ, the 'way'. Von C. declares also that the Jews lacked a missionary task but this is belied by Is.43.10,12; 44.8 and Jonah; he states: "Es fehlt (to the Jewish martyrs) das geschichtliche Zeugnis, das ihm zum Zeugen macht" but this does not take into account the fact that the torah contains more than just ethical commands.

(2) Jn. 1.34, cf. R. Asting, Die Verkündigung, p. 673.

(3) Burnier (La Notion de Témoignage dans le Nouveau Testament, pp. 43-47, 65-69) shows the close connection of testimony, gospel and kerygma and many other terms which indicate 'the preaching of the Gospel' throughout the NT writings.

(a) The sovereignty of God is referred to in John's preaching that the kingdom of heaven⁽¹⁾ is at hand (Mt. 3.2; cf. Dan. 2.44) and the lordship of Jesus is expressed in the testimony that he is the light which enlightens every man who comes into the world, the one who was before John although he came after him and indeed is above all.⁽²⁾ (b) God's moral law is stressed in John's demand for 'fruits meet for repentance' from his audiences (Mt. 3.2,8,10; cf. Mk. 1.4; Lk. 3.8-14), his rebuking of Herod's licence (Mt. 14.4; cf. Lk. 3.19) and Jesus' reference to John's coming 'in the way of righteousness' (Mt. 21.32). (c) God's redemptive action, conceived of as the remission of sins, takes the place of the release from Egypt (Mk. 1.4) in the Baptist's proclamation; this is in accord with his father's prophecy that he was to "Give knowledge of salvation to his people by the remission of their sins" (Lk. 1.77; cf. 3.6) and he points to Jesus as the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (Jn. 1.29,36). (d) The promise of God is of the coming one who will gather his wheat into the garner but who will burn up the chaff (Mt. 3.3,11f; Mk. 1.7; Lk. 3.16f.)

John's Authority

John the Baptist had no official authority. Although he was the son of a priest, he took no part in the priestly offices (Lk. 1.80). His authority was that of the OT prophets; the crowds counted him as a prophet (Mt. 14.5; 21.26; cf. Lk. 20.6);

(1) Schechter (Aspects p.65): "The idea of the Kingdom of God, derived from the Shema is described by some rabbis as the very 'Truth' (or essence) of the Torah."

(2) Jn. 1.7-9; cf. Ac. 13.25; Jn. 3.31.

Jesus described him as being more than a prophet, a second Elijah, the forerunner of the Messiah (Mt. 17.12f; 11.9; cf. Lk. 1.76) and claimed that there was no prophet greater than he (Mt. 11.11f. par). He is the messenger of God, apostled by God (Mt. 11.10; Mk. 1.2; Jn. 1.6,33; 3.28); the angel told Zacharias that his son would be filled with the Holy Spirit from his conception so that he would go in the spirit and power of Elijah (Lk. 1.15,17). The various references to John's μαθηταί (Mt. 9.14; Mk. 1.7; Lk. 3.16; Jn. 1.15,27,30; 3.29f.) show that he was a teacher⁽¹⁾ and the author of the Fourth Gospel confirms this when his disciples and the Jews address him as 'Rabbi' (Jn. 3.26); in Luke the publicans address him as Διδάσκαλε (3.12). John himself confesses that his authority is less than that of Jesus who will baptise with the Holy Spirit (Mt. 3.11, par; Jn. 1.15,27,30; 3.29f.) and Jesus teaches that he who is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John (Mt. 11.11). Thus John is seen to have an authority which sets itself over against the hereditary authority of the religious leaders but which is less than that of any Christian, who has a greater knowledge of Jesus. He himself is aware of his call but he has no way of proving this except by the terms of his message, the prophetic testimony. His authority is the authority of the word he proclaims, the authority of the μαρτυρίου.⁽²⁾

(1) Friedrich (KWB. III. 704. 24f.) denies this but gives no reason: "Er tritt nicht als Lehrer vor die Gemeinde und legt im Gottesdienst die Schrift aus, sondern er rüttelt die Menschen aus ihrem Schlaf^{auf} und macht sie aufmerksam auf das, was kommen wird, wie die Propheten."

(2) Fascher (ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, pp. 176,180) plays down the authority of John as against that of Jesus by explaining the phrase φωνὴ βοῶντος as 'nur ein Zeuge'. Dodd also (The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p.292) writes: "And it is to be observed that while in Matthew and Luke the Baptist has much of the character of the preacher of righteousness which attaches to him in Josephus, in John as in Mark he is simply a witness to

The Authority of the Testimony

In Jn. 1.32 the Baptist testifies that he has seen the Spirit descending like a dove on Jesus.⁽¹⁾ Testimony to Jesus is spiritual testimony which is given by God (Jn. 1.33); it is "the absolute truth manifested by revelation and received only by faith."⁽²⁾ St. John represents his namesake as saying: "He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure to him." (Jn. 3.34). It would appear, then, that the testimony is a charisma, that John the Baptist's ministry, like that of all the prophets before him, is charismatic; and, further, that this charisma has a static character in the sense that it is not so much a sudden, dramatic and temporary ecstasy but an abiding conviction of eternal truth, the words of God, the light.⁽³⁾ The testimony has an inherent authority which depends on faith in the hearer: "John came to testify to the light that all might believe through him (Jn. 1.7). There were some who said that John had a devil, they did to him whatsoever they listed (Mt. 11.18; 14.3-5; 17.12; 21.25-27,32) and there were others, his disciples, who believed him and followed Jesus.

the coming of the Messiah"; but in the Fourth Gospel Jesus more than once describes himself as a witness.

(1) "The historical witness gives place to the moral", says Bernard (ICC.p.xciii), referring to I Jn. 5.7f., but although the Baptist is an historical person his testimony is not simply historical, it is not simply as B. would have it (p.48; cf. 452), to the effect that John saw a dove or pigeon alight on Jesus but that he also 'saw' the Spirit. Jesus says that he does not receive historical testimony (Jn.5.33). Casey (The Beginnings of Christianity I.p. 34) is nearer the truth when he writes: "John the Baptist's testimony is to a fact, the descent upon Jesus of the Spirit, but the real *παράδειγμα* is the consequence of that fact, ie. that Jesus is the Light, the Logos, "the Son of God etc."

(2) Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, p.182.

(3) Dodd (The Authority of the Bible, pp.189f., 299) denies "a static finality in religion" as, for example, a fixing of the Torah but there are truths which do not change, such as this biblical testimony.

The Transmission of the Testimony

John, as has been noted, had his disciples to whom he entrusted his teaching and his baptism and who were prepared to argue about it with the Jews, presumably the official teachers (Ac.18.25; 19.3). That the particular manifestation of the testimony presented by John should be superseded by the fuller teaching of the early church was inevitable, indeed John himself had foretold this (Jn. 3.30).

Conclusion

This short study of the testimony of John the Baptist serves to show that his testimony is basically that of Moses, the prophets and the psalms and that John is a bridge between the OT and the NT in that he points to Jesus as the fulfilment of the OT testimony. The Baptist's heralding of Jesus as the Coming One has its source in his spiritual vision and his authority is thus dependent on the impact which his message makes on his hearers. John's testimony is that he saw the Spirit descending and remaining on Jesus in the bodily form of a dove but this cannot be called eye-witness testimony which would have to be confined to his seeing the dove. That Jesus was in full possession of the Spirit of God John could know only by revelation (cf. Is. 40.3,13f; 41.18,27; 42.1,4f; 44.3 etc.). Thus John's testimony is a charisma and yet it is not an ephemeral thing for it is basically the way of righteousness, the way of the Lord, the way which Jesus taught and will claim to be (Jn. 14.6), the four-fold testimony which has been revealed again and again to Israel by prophet and priest and which has now become flesh.

CHAPTER VIITHE TESTIMONY OF JESUS IN THE SYNOPTICS AND ACTSThe Nature of the Testimony

In the Synoptic Gospels the word μαρτύριον is used to denote the message which Jesus brought, which he entrusted to his disciples and which he gave them authority to teach and proclaim and testify.⁽¹⁾ In Mt. 10.18 Jesus tells them that they will be brought before authorities and kings for his sake, that is, for the sake of his Gospel, with a view to his Gospel (εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς). This μαρτύριον is what Jesus has told them in darkness (ie. privately); it is the proclamation of the kingdom of heaven and also the actions which present the doctrine in dramatic form. This testimony, presented in public, will be in fact the gift of the Holy Spirit (Mt. 10.19f.) Passages parallel to this are found in the apocalyptic discourse; Mt. 24.14 reads: "And this gospel of the kingdom will be proclaimed in the whole world εἰς μαρτύριον", showing that what the disciples are to proclaim is what Jesus proclaimed (cf. Mk. 1.14f.). Mk. 13.9 reads: "You shall be brought before authorities and kings

(1) Morgenthaler (Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, II), by a study of the literary form in connection with the OT legal necessity for two or three witnesses, has shown that Luke's Gospel is his Testimony concerning Jesus. M. carries his argument perhaps a little too far, for the biblical witness idea is not simply legal but his evidence is certainly striking, drawn as it is from the frequency of double names: "Es geht also Lk in all diesen Namenpaaren um den apostolischen Grundsatz der Doppelzeugung" (p.10); geographical name-pairing; double words, eg. spirit and truth, signs and wonders; antitheses, eg. God and man, seeing and hearing; double quotations; double logia; three-fold phrases; parallel speeches; even the double work: Gospel and Acts; "Es gibt ja sozusagen nichts, was er nicht zweimal erzählt." (p.22). Cf. A. Barr (Expository Times, XLIX, pp.401-8) for a study of the factor of testimony in the Gospels; Nineham, JTS, 9(1958), pp. 13-25; 243-252.

for my sake (for my name's sake, v.13) εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς and the gospel must first be preached to all the nations." Lk. 21.12f. speaks of the disciples being brought before kings and authorities for the sake of Jesus' name (ie. his message) and it will turn to them εἰς μαρτύριον ⁽¹⁾ (ie. it will give them an opportunity of delivering testimony). Each of these last verses is followed by Jesus' statement that the μαρτύριον will be given to them by the Holy Spirit (Mk. 13.11), ie. by himself who will give them στόμα καὶ σοφία (Lk.21.15). The μαρτύριον is the prophetic word. ⁽²⁾

The basic description of Jesus' testifying is that he proclaimed (κηρύσσειν), ⁽³⁾ taught (διδάσκειν), ⁽⁴⁾ (Mt. 4.23 etc.), fulfilled the law and the prophets (Mt.5. 17-20 etc.) and did mighty works (Mt.4.23 etc.) which are closely associated with healing, in accordance with the

(1) As in Ex.2.4 where ἀποβαίνειν is used to translate נָשַׁב but it is also used in LXX for κηρύττειν which means 'to publish' a report (Nu.14.37; Dt.22.14,19; Ne.6.19 and 'to promulgate' doctrine (Is.42.3, Heb.).

(2) Cf. Ps.118.88 and many other places; not simply an irksome testimony against their accusers in the Last Judgement as Bosch has it (Die Heidenmission, p.161).

(3) Cf. Friedrich (KWB.III.715.32): "das heilige und unvergängliche Kerygma ist gewissermaßen eine Lehre, die von der ewigen Errettung handelt."

(4) Cf. Rengstorff (KWB.II.pp.142f.) where the teaching of Jesus is said to have the same restricted ethical content as that of Judaism, differing only with regard to his own person, ie. in his selfconsciousness. Dealing with the Johannine use of διδάσκειν R. states (146.1ff): "In allen Fällen handelt es sich somit um die Begabung mit einer διδάχῃ um einer höheren Welt. Das ist ein Gebrauch von διδάσκειν, den wir bei den Synoptikern vergeblich suchen." But Jesus' teaching is really always regarded as a gift from above; that this is the meaning of the Baptism is confirmed also by the ἐξουσία given to Jesus by God in his healing/teaching (Lk.5.17; Mt.9.8). Again, Mk. 8.31 speaks of Jesus teaching his disciples that the Son of Man must suffer many things...and after three days rise again. Further, Jesus' teaching in the temple (Mt. 26.55) included much more than morality. Finally, the false witnesses at the trial describe Jesus' claim to be Χριστὸν βασιλέα (Lk.23.2),

prophecy of Isaiah 6.9b-10, quoted in Mt.13.14f.⁽¹⁾ The title 'Ραββεί or Διδάσκαλος is used of Jesus by his disciples and the rulers of the Jews alike.⁽²⁾ His preaching and teaching are described variously as 'good news' (εὐαγγέλιον, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι)⁽³⁾ (Mt.4.23; etc), 'report' (ἀκρόη) (Mt.4.24; Mk.1.28; Mt.14.1 cf. Is.55.1), his 'yoke' (Mt.11.29f.);⁽⁴⁾ the word of the kingdom (Mt.13.19); the gospel of (the kingdom of) God (Mk.1.14);⁽⁵⁾ the word of God (Lk.5.1); revelation (Mt.11.25); a παράδοσις received from God and passed on to others (Mt.11.27 cf. Lk.10.22; Mt.25.14,20,22); the mysteries

as διδάσκων (v.5). Cf. Daube (JTS, XXXIX, p.45): "Ἐξουσία may correspond to the Hebrew מְלִיץ or the Aramaic מְלִיץ in its technical sense, i.e. qua authority to lay down such doctrines and decisions as are of binding force;" cf. pp.46; 52, note 2; 53. See also Riesenfeld: The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings, p.24.

(1) See Prov.3.21-22a where God's counsel is described as ἡ σοφία τῆς σαφείας.

(2) In view of all this evidence it is impossible to accept Rengstorff's statements: "Am bedeutungsvollsten ist, dass in der Erinnerung der Jünger Jesus als Lehrer völlig im Hintergrund gestanden zu haben scheint." (KWB, IV, 457.39f.) and that Jesus "ist für die Jünger nirgends (!) ein Schulhaupt, sondern stets der lebendige Herr der Seinen." (458.10f.). In fact he was both! Cf. Ig. Mag.9.1f: μαθηταὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μόνου διδασκάλου ἡμῶν..... οὐ καὶ οἱ προφηταὶ μαθηταὶ ὄντες τῷ πνεύματι ὡς διδασκαλὸν αὐτὸν προσεδόκων; See also Diem, Ev. Theol., 11(1935), p.424.

(3) Cf. Michel (KWB, V.213, note 40): "Μαετυρεῖν vertritt im jeh Sprachkreis vielfach das synopt εὐαγγελίζεσθαι."; cf. Friedrich KWB, II.714.25ff. and Bultmann, Theology I, p.87.

(4) For rabbinic references to the use of 'yoke' for torah see Aboth 3.7; Berak 2.2,5; II Bar. 41.3; Ps. Sol. 7.8; 17.32; Sir. 51.26.

(5) Dalman (Words of Jesus, pp.161f.) shows the identity of 'kingdom of God' and 'eternal life'.

of the kingdom of heaven (Mt.13.11; Mk.4.11; Lk.8.10); wisdom (σοφία) (Mt.12.42; 13.54; Mk.6.2); knowledge (γνῶσις) (Lk.1.77; 11.52); prophecy (Mt. 13.57; Mk.6.4; Lk.4.24; 7.16; 24.19);⁽¹⁾ the way of God (Mt.22.16); the command (ἐντολή) of God (Mt.15.3; Mk.7.8) and exhortation (παράκλησις) (Lk.3.18). The act of testifying is rendered by expressions such as: sowing the word (Mt.13.3-23; Mk.4.3-20), speaking in parables (Mt.13.3,13ff; Mk.4.2)⁽²⁾, interpreting the scriptures (Lk.24.27), opening the scriptures (Lk.24.32) and shepherding (Mk.6.34). All these find verbal parallels in the LXX references to the Mosaic and prophetic ministry of the word⁽³⁾ and it is obvious that the synoptic writers conceive of Jesus' teaching work as being of the same order as that of the Baptist and his spiritual forebears⁽⁴⁾ for Jesus himself is quoted as saying: "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do" (Mt.23.2f.). In the parable

(1) See Dodd (Mysterium Christi, pp.60-62): "In the teaching of Jesus the emphasis is placed once more where the great prophets had placed it." Holl (Gesammelte Aufsätze, II.p.79) inclines to the view that "im Zusammenhang damit (the idea that the prophet must suffer death) das Wort *μάρτυς* in einem neuen Sinn für den Propheten aufkam" noting that the activity of the prophet is frequently indicated by *διαμαρτυρεῖσθαι* and *διαμαρτυρία*. It is doubtful if this is the true connection, and also if the idea was new.

(2) See above p. 61, note 3.

(3) E.g. sowing the word (Prov.11.18; Is.28.7-29; Jer. 4.3 and esp. Is. 55.10ff.); speaking in parables (Nu.23.7; Ps.77.2; Ezek.17.2; 24.3); interpreting the scriptures (Sir.47.17); opening the scriptures (Hos.2.17; Ps.48.5; Is.42.7,20; 45.3); shepherding (Jer.3.15; Ezek.34.4ff; Zech.10.2f.).

(4) Cf. Carrington (The Primitive Christian Catechism, p.96): "We may even see in our Lord the champion of the old Jewish piety against the new piety of the Pharisees." Davies (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p.144): "Jesus preached a new torah from the mount." and (p.144): "Paul must have regarded Jesus in the light of a new Moses." Deissmann (The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, pp.82f., 129): "the holy spark had leapt from the Baptist to Him."

of Lazarus and Dives (Lk.16.19-31) the latter is represented as praying that the beggar be sent to testify (ὥπως διαμαρτύρηται) to his five brothers, that is, to underline the testimony of Moses and the prophets (v.29), the original gospel of God,⁽¹⁾ by the testimony of the Resurrection, and Abraham avers that the testimony of a resurrected person is no more compelling than the OT μαρτύριον for those who cannot or will not 'see' or 'hear'.⁽²⁾ It is important to realise that this parable is spoken against the Pharisees who have been 'unfaithful servants of God', that is, false witnesses or teachers of the torah which cannot fail (Lk.16.17) and who therefore are incapable of receiving (the message of) the kingdom of God (Lk.16.16.31)⁽³⁾

The Content of the Testimony

An examination of the Content of Jesus' Testimony reveals that it is basically the same as the authentic OT testimony, as was that of John the Baptist⁽⁴⁾ and this is succinctly stated by Jesus himself in Mt. 23.2f. His torah is the OT torah purified

(1) Cf. Mt.5.17: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil."; cf. Mk.7.8-10: Östborn (Tora in the Old Testament, pp.157-164) shows the close relationship of the OT torah to the teaching of Jesus. Asting: (Die Verkündigung, p.596) still holds to the narrow interpretation that Lazarus is "Träger eines Willens".

(2) Günther is surely wrong in limiting the content of the testimony to "die Warnung eines aus dem Jenseits Kommenden vor dem Gericht." (ZNW 47 (1956).p.154,note 66). Surkau (Martyrien in jüdischer und frühchristlicher Zeit, p.141) is wide of the mark when he writes: "Der Stamm 'mart' wird in synoptischen Schrifttum kaum verwandt, und wo er auftritt, hat er rein forensische Bedeutung." The first remark is true enough but the occurrences of μαρτύριον most certainly have a prophetic and didactic sense.

(3) Günther also (Μάρτυς, p.123) has too narrow a conception of Lazarus' testimony: "um vor den fünf Brüdern des Reichen die Tatsache eines letzten Ausgleichs 'zu bezeugen' und dieses sein Zeugnis musste naturgemäss zur Busspredigt werden."

(4) Cf. Bosch: Die Heidenmission in der Zukunftschau Jesu, p. 55f. and Line: The Doctrine of the Christian Ministry, p.46. The view represented by Sabatier (The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit, p.223) that Jesus "cast into the shadow of the past the law of Moses" cannot be sustained in view of dominical sayings such as Mt. 5.18. Cf. Branscomb (Jesus and the Law of Moses) for Jesus' sympathetic and obedient attitude to synagogue, temple and torah.

and stripped of its non-essentials⁽¹⁾ and summed up in his own person. (a) In his preaching about the kingdom of God Jesus provides the first aspect of the testimony, viz. the sovereignty of God (e.g. Mt. 4.17; 13.11; Mk.1.15; 10.14; Lk.4.43; 8.1,10; 9.11,27f; 16.16; 17.21f; 18.17,24; 19.11; 21.31; Ac.1.3). Jesus also teaches that God is the God of all nations (Mk.11.17) and shows his own power over the forces of nature (Mt.8.27) and of the spiritual world (Lk. 4.34,41). (b) The commandments of the law are also upheld by Jesus who, in the Sermon on the Mount, says: "Whosoever shall do and teach them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven" and insists that his followers' righteousness should exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees (Mt.5.17-20). He disowns workers of iniquity (Mt.7.23), preaches repentance (Mt.12.41) and in many passages insists on scrupulous observance of the moral law (Mt.15.3ff; 19.17ff; 22.37-40; 25.34-46; Mk.10.19; Lk. 5.32; 6.9; 10.25-37; 11.41)⁽²⁾. When Jesus says to the leper whom he has healed: ὑπάγε σεαυτὸν δείξον τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκον τὸ δῶρον ὃ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς (Mt.8.4 par.) he acknowledges that the ritual in Leviticus, part of the testimony of the OT, is to be obeyed. (c) At the beginning of Matthew the angel announces to Joseph that the child about to be born will save his people and

(1) Cf. Dahl: Stud. Theol. I and II. 1947/48, p.89. For Jesus as prophet see Fascher: ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, pp.176-180. Dodd's distinction between preaching and teaching (The Apostolic Preaching, pp.3ff. and passim) cannot be sustained in view of the evidence already adduced above and that of verses like Ac.15.21 and Ro.2.21.

(2) Friedrich's distinction between Jesus' teaching and proclaiming is too clear-cut (KWB. III.713.1-21). Διδασκαλία according to Ro.15.4 must have some hope-inspiring content and, according to I Tim.1.10f., the gospel includes διδασκαλία.

when the Baptist's disciples are sent to Jesus to ask if he is the Messiah he points to his saving work (Mt.11.4f.) which is a fulfilment of Is.61.1f. (cf. Lk. 4.18-21). Jesus says that he has come to save that which has been lost (Mt.18.11) and to give his life a ransom for many (Mt.20.28). His blood of the new covenant is shed for many for the remission of sins (Mt. 26.28). (d) The fourth aspect of the testimony, the promise of future blessing or future doom⁽¹⁾ is expressed in many passages. Jesus says that the son of man will come in the glory of his Father and then he shall reward every man according to his works (Mt.16.27); the husbandmen who illtreat the servants and kill the son will be destroyed (Mt.21.41); the son of man shall come with power and great glory and the angels will gather together his elect (Mt.24.30f; 25.33); he speaks of his own resurrection and his perfecting (Lk.13.32) and in his resurrection appearance to his disciples he tells them to wait in Jerusalem until they are endowed with spiritual power from on high (Lk.24.49; Ac.1.4,8).

The synoptic writers present the teaching of Jesus as a development and a fulfilment of the prophetic testimony of the OT; the underlying principles are exactly the same, for Jesus came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it (Mt.5.17). He denounces the Sadducees for not knowing the scriptures and states that all the law and the prophets hang on the two commandments: "Love God and love your neighbour". The advance on the OT teaching made by Jesus is his claim to be himself the giver and the fulfiller of the law; this is seen in the refrain in the Sermon on the Mount: "It was said by them of old time.... but I say unto you" (Mt.5.21f.etc) and in the Baptism story:

(1) Cf. Friedrich (KWB. III.710.27): Gericht und Gnade sind in demselben Wort enthalten."

"Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." To say, as Farrer does⁽¹⁾ that the reduction of the apostolic authority to the written word "is impossible: it implies a static Christendom whose activity is nothing but obedience to its title-deeds" is to overlook Jesus' own example of adherence to the fourfold testimony of Moses and the prophets. It will become clear that it was only in respect of this unchanging testimony that Jesus himself had any authority which could be called spiritual. That is to say, Jesus' power to elicit faith in himself as Lord and Saviour depended on the word which he spoke or demonstrated in action and on the response of the hearer; both word and response depend on the power of the Spirit (Lk.4.32; 24.29). This is not to say that Jesus' personality, characterised as it was by the 'spiritual virtues' of piety, goodness, compassion, humility and so forth, did not impress people or that he was not, for example, an exorcist who by his knowledge and 'spiritual' power was able to cast out demons, but his authority was essentially a teaching one resting on his total message concerning his own person.

The Authority of the Witness

The authority of Jesus is not regarded by these evangelists as being of an official kind⁽²⁾ but as being spiritual and prophetic,⁽³⁾ indeed it is, for them, a teaching authority.⁽⁴⁾

(1) The Ministry in the New Testament, p.179

(2) Cf. von Campenhausen (KA. und GV., p.4): "Er handelt völlig frei als der, der er ist, und in diesem umfassenden Sinne 'in Vollmacht'"; also pp.10f.

(3) Cf. Grundmann (KWB. II. 300-302): "Seine (Jesus') Kraft hat er im heiligen Geist - Geist und Kraft gehören für Lk unauflöslich zusammen -, in ihr verwirklicht er seine ἐξουσία." See also Cullmann (The Christology of the New Testament, p.44): "The authority (ἐξουσία) with which Jesus proclaimed his Gospel was not that of any ordinary prophet but that of the final prophet."

(4) Cf. Greeven (ZNW. 44(1952/3), p.26, note 61) for Jesus' rabbinic authority. Von Campenhausen (KA. und GV., p.27) distinguishes between the prophetic authority of the apostles which he likens

Jesus is said to have the Holy Spirit from his conception (Mt. 1.20; Lk. 1.35); all three evangelists record the coming upon him of the Spirit at his baptism (Mt.3.16; Mk.1.10; Lk.3.22) and that it was the Spirit who led him into the desert to be tempted (Mt.4.1; Mk.1.12; Lk.4.1). Like the prophets of old he has been sent (ἀποστέλλειν) by God (Mt.10.40; Mk.9.37; Lk.9.48; cf. Lk.20.13) and is God's servant (Mt.12.18; cf. Lk.4.18). He describes himself as greater than Jonah (Mt.12.41)⁽¹⁾ and when the people of Galilee are offended by his lack of credentials he implies that he is a prophet (Mk.6.4; Mt.13.57; cf. Lk.4.24; 13.33).⁽²⁾ On Palm Sunday the multitudes hail Jesus as the prophet of Galilee (Mt.21.11,46; Mk.6.15; 8.28; Lk.7.16; 24.19) and when he is challenged by the chief priests and elders to show his authority for his behaviour in the temple⁽³⁾ he infers that his authority is the same as that of John the

to that of the OT prophets and the immediate authority of Jesus: "Bei Jesus liess sich zwischen seiner Person und seiner Sendung keine Grenze mehr ziehen." But the evidence already brought shows that in his earthly aspect Jesus was a prophet with a doctrine and a call.

⁽¹⁾ See above p. 140 note 3.

⁽²⁾ Cf. Grundmann. KWB.II.310. Friedrich (KWB.VI.842.37 - 843.24) points out that Jesus did not actually call himself a prophet (this is true of all the prophets!) but only applied a saying about prophets to himself. The assertion that Jesus is a prophet or a teacher would not seem to imply less reverence for him as 'Son of God' than to say that he was a carpenter!

Surkau (Martyrien, p.141) holds that in Mt.16.14 Jesus refuses the title of prophet but this is not actually stated. While the term 'prophet' does not by any means exhaust the true description of Jesus the idea must certainly be included in it.

⁽³⁾ Glombitza (ZNW.49.(1958), p.277) avers that Luke uses the title ἐπιστάτης when Jesus is asked to show his authority and not in respect of Jesus as head of a school of philosophy. But on the occasions when it appears it is clear that a teaching authority is referred to; Lk.5.5; 8.24f,45; 9.33-35,49; 17.13 all refer to healing and nature miracles which were recognised as part of Jesus' teaching ministry.

Baptist and it has as little influence as that of his cousin with those who refuse to recognise it (Mt.21.23-27).⁽¹⁾

Jesus' opposition to the priests is similar to that of the OT prophets who did not have a different torah but took up a different attitude towards it. It is interesting to see the echo of Is. 28.9 in Mt.13.54-57 and Jn.7.15.⁽²⁾ In Mt.22.16 the Pharisees acknowledge the true and faithful testimony of Jesus in an ironical echo of Mal.2.7-9. That John the Baptist and Jesus are regarded by Luke as the fulfilment of Malachi's prophecy of the coming of the messenger and the swift witness to deal judgement to those who are unfaithful to his law (Mal.3.1-7) may be seen from a comparison of this passage and Lk.20.1-13,45-47.

Since it is prophetic the authority of Jesus may also be described as a teaching one; "The people were astonished at his doctrine for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes." (Mt.7.28, cf.13.54).⁽³⁾ Jesus at one point, stressing his own authority, warns his disciples against being called 'Rabbi' for one is their teacher (Mt.23.8).⁽⁴⁾ The Pharisees regarded him as a teacher for they sent their disciples with the Herodians who said: Διδάσκαλε, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς εἶ καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ διδάσκεις.

(1) Cf. Dodd (The Authority of the Bible, p.234): "Jesus' authority does not silence private judgement" and "In a sense we might say that Jesus never told men anything about God but what they could see for themselves" (p.290).

(2) Cf. Ostborn. (Tora in the Old Testament, pp.127-130).

(3) Cf. Fascher (ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, p.126) where it is shown that in Mk. 1.21ff. (Lk.4.16ff.) προφήτης = ἀνὴρ σοφὸς καὶ δυνατός

(4) Cf. Rengstorf (KWB.II.156f.) for rabbinic examples showing that "die Stellung Jesus in seinem Jüngerkreise wirklich die des διδάσκαλος seiner Umwelt, des jüdischen Rabbi, unter seinen Schülern war."

(Mt.22.16). Jesus' teaching, preaching and healing activity are very closely connected (Mt.9.34 etc.)⁽¹⁾ and it may well be that accounts of healings such as opening the eyes of the blind and the ears of the deaf are picturesque ways of denoting successful teaching.⁽²⁾ A paralysed man is enabled to walk to prove Jesus' power (ἐξουσία) to forgive sins (Mk.2.1-12; par.)⁽³⁾, at the beginning of Jesus' Galilean ministry the

(1) Daube, referring to the relationship of teaching and exorcism in JTS. XXXIX, p.58, note 2, says: "As regards Jewish history in particular one might almost say that knowledge of the Law, the working of miracles and prophecy were closely connected at all periods."

(2) Cf. Gerhardsson (Memory and Manuscript, pp.183,186f.) and Denney, (The Authority of Christ in Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, p.151b): "The proof of the authority with which he spoke did not lie outside of his word, in something which could be attached to it, but in the word itself; if it was not self-attesting, nothing else could attest it."

(3) Dibelius (From Tradition to Gospel) classifies this story among those Paradigms which "represent the type in noteworthy purity" (p.43), of such he says that they "are not the words and works of a god but of a teacher. And even in a few stories of healing to be found among the Paradigms, the point is usually not the healing but the teaching about the forgiveness of sins or breach of the Sabbath, which teaching Jesus confirms by the healing.....What the Churches preserved of the words of their Master as rules and for teaching purposes shows the sign of a teacher rather than a god." (pp.266f.). The point must be made, however, that in the OT the original author of all true teaching about God is God Himself; He is the Teacher of teachers (eg. Ex.4.15; Dt.5.31; 1 Chron.6.27; Ps.24.8f., 10,12; 118.171; Is.2.3; 54.13; Jer.39.33; Mic.4.2 and many other places); he is the μαετρος; along with his chosen πατρις and his remnant (Is.43.10; 44.8). Jn.6.45 shows that the early Church identified Jesus the teacher with God the Teacher: "It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." D. also (p.42) correctly approves of von Soden's distinction between narratives like that contained in Mk.2.1 or 3.6 from the comprehensive stories of the group in 4.35 - 5.43: "In the former all interest is centred upon the actual words of Jesus. In the latter the process as such is what matters." (Die wichtigsten Fragen im Leben Jesu (1904), p.23) and shows (pp.44f.) that 3.6 sets the section 2.1 - 3.5 in connection with the Passion.

people are all amazed, describing what he does as "new teaching according to authority."⁽¹⁾

Foerster's analysis of Jesus' prophetic, teaching authority is well expressed: "Das ist daraus (Mk.11.28; Mt.9.8; Mk.1.22; par.) zu verstehen, dass damals im Judentum das Gefühl lebendig war es seien kein Propheten da. Auch die rabbinische Auslegung will nur Auslegung, keine Prophetie sein, dh. sie spricht nicht mit unmittelbarer Autorität, mit ἐξουσία (vgl. I Makk.4.46). 'Εξουσία (= מְלִיכָה) setzt göttlichen Auftrag und Bevollmächtigung voraus, die zugleich Macht ist, und das Besondere dieser ἐξουσία ist, dass sie von der Verkündigung, dass das Reich Gottes "nahe" ist, nicht zu trennen ist. Indem der Träger dieser ἐξουσία, der Macht zu heilen und Sünden zu vergeben, da ist, ist auch das Reich Gottes da."⁽²⁾ Bultmann's view⁽³⁾ that Jesus had no messianic consciousness is based on the argument that his life and work, measured by traditional messianic ideas, was not messianic, that the 'Anointed' had come to mean simply 'king'. But Jesus was certainly not tied to the rabbinic views of his day. As far as can be gathered he came to restore the OT prophetic view and in the OT the anointed ones are not only kings but also, and primarily, the priests (Ex.28.41) and prophets (III K.19.16). In the NT anointing is closely connected with the imparting of doctrine⁽⁴⁾ (I Jn. 2.27,⁽⁵⁾ cf. Jn.9.6, II Cor. 1.21, Rev. 3.18). When John

(1) Lk. 4.36 reads: Τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν καὶ ἔξερχονται; thus identifying teaching and healing.

(2) KWB. II.566.19-29.

(3) Theology of the NT, I, pp.26-32.

(4) Bultmann will have it that Jesus' doctrinal statements are valued not because of their content but because they are the word of the Messianic King (Theology, I, pp.42-47) but admits that "according to rabbinic ideas the Messiah, when he comes, will also act as a teacher of Torah. Cf. Seidelin, ZNW. (35), (1936), 194 ff., Volz; Die Eschatologie der jüd. Gemeinde (1934) p.218).

(5) But see below p. 227, note 1.

sends his disciples to ask Jesus if he is the prophet promised in Dt.18.15 the latter points to his teaching/healing activity as 'proof' or indication that this is so.⁽¹⁾

The Authority of the Testimony

Since Jesus renounced all temporal authority he depended for his influence on the authority of his message for which he makes the exclusive claim that it is a complete revelation received from God (Mt.11.27; cf. Gal.1.11f.) as opposed to the tradition of the Pharisees⁽²⁾ and that the one thing needful is to hear his word (Lk.10.39,42) for it is the fulfilment of the law⁽³⁾ which will exist until the end of time (Mt.24.35) and which confers greatness upon the one who teaches it (Mt. 5.17-19). Jesus always bases his teaching on the OT scriptures and these are spoken by God (Mt.22.31)⁽⁴⁾ - their authors speak by the Spirit (Mt.22.43). Thus, to reject Jesus, ie. to reject his teaching, is to reject God (Lk.10.16). Jesus' own teaching is

(1) See Friedrich (KWB.VI.848.10 - 849.35) for illustration of the way in which Jesus fulfils this prophecy.

(2) Cf. Josephus (Antiquities,13.10.6); "the Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many observances by succession from their fathers, which are not written in the laws of Moses; and for that reason it is that the Sadducees reject them, and say that we are to esteem those observances to be obligatory which are in the written word, but are not to observe what are derived from the tradition of our forefathers." (Whiston's translation).

(3) Friedrich (KWB. 702.30 - 703.4) sees in the infrequent use of κήρυγμα compared with that of κηρύσσειν that most value is attached to the act of proclaiming for this is the decisive thing through which the kingdom of God comes but this is hardly correct for it is faith and obedience to the message which show the coming of the kingdom.

(4) Büchsel (KWB. II.p.173.18-21) denies that πάντα μοι παραδόθη can be understood of traditional teaching from the past for this, he says, is excluded by ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου. But Mt.11.27-30 and 13.16f; (cf.Lk.10.22-24) with their references to knowing, seeing and hearing and the yoke show that Jesus is thinking of the essence of the OT teaching as the word of God; this view is strengthened by the subsequent passage in Lk.10.26f. where the lawyer expresses the essential and eternally valid content of the law.

a spiritual gift⁽¹⁾ which does not elicit faith from all men but depends on spiritual 'seeing' and 'hearing'.⁽²⁾ Jesus speaks in parables but the people seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand (Mt.13.13; par.)⁽³⁾. It was when Jesus opened the scriptures to Cleopas and his companion that their eyes were opened and they knew him (Lk. 24.31f.). He repeatedly calls on those who have ears to hear (Mt.11.15; 13.9,43; Mk.4.9; Lk. 8.8). The disciples did not consider the miracles of the loaves for their heart was hardened (Mk.6.52; cf.8.17f.) and when Jesus told them

(1) Luke reports (4.14f.): "And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee.....and he taught in their synagogues". Cf. Mt.12.28 and Mt.12.18: "I will put my spirit upon him and he shall show judgement to the Gentiles."

(2) Cf. Michel, *Prophet und Märtyrer*, pp.9f; Diem, *Ev. Theol.* 1. (1934/5), pp.424f.

(3) Even the disciples show signs of this blindness and deafness in their discussion about bread and leaven (Mt. 15.5-12; par.). It is not unlikely that behind these references to seeing and hearing in connection with Jesus' parabolic speech or action there lies the thought of Ps.77 in which the writer announces that he will speak in parables, in the προβλήματα which have been from the beginning (v.2), the whole religious tradition (v.3), the μαρτύριον or torah (v.5) that the people of God might not forget the works of God but diligently seek his commandments. (Is.29.18,24 make it clear that seeing = knowing and obeying God). Ps.77 sheds further light on Mk.8.14-21 where Jesus asks the disciples if they are also blind because they misunderstood his reference to bread, for this psalm tells of God's fulfilling his promise to feed his people, preparing a table for them in the wilderness, and then of their lack of trust and their tempting God in asking for meat for their souls (ταῖς ψυχαῖς) and asking if he would be able to give bread to his people. (vv.18f.,22-25)...and yet they did not keep his testimonies (καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐφυλάξαντο) (v.56); cf. Is.42.18-20: "And who is blind, but my servants (παῖδες)? And deaf, but they that rule over them? And the servants of God have been made blind. Εἶδετε πλέον ἄκισ, καὶ οὐκ ἐφυλάξασθε."

solemnly that he would be betrayed "they understood not this saying and it was hid from them that they perceived it not." (Lk.9.44f., and, more explicitly, 18.31-34). Bultmann⁽¹⁾ speaks of "the fact that for the Church, as for Jesus himself, the content of his message was not the decisive thing" but that he "demanded decision for his person as the bearer of the Word." But the decision cannot be made in any meaningful way before acceptance of the teaching which included the claim of being able to give life.

The Transmission of the Testimony

The view of the 'Formgeschichte' school that the 'Sitz im Leben' of the earliest Gospel tradition was mission preaching and teaching has recently been denied by Riesenfeld⁽²⁾ who claims that the Gospel tradition belongs to a category which is sui generis (pp. 9-16). He points out that the terminology used by the Mishnah to describe the Jewish process of tradition reappears in the NT although the content is quite different (p.17). The people who carried on the former tradition were specially selected disciples and were an exactly defined group within the community (pp.18f.). The technical terms to which R. refers are παραλαμβάνειν and παραδίδόναι which correspond to terms in the Mishnah which are used for "the rigidly controlled transmission of matter from one who has the mastery of it to another who has been specially chosen to learn it." (pp.17f.). Παραδίδόναι is found in the Synoptics in Mk.4.29 where it is used for the sending forth of the fruit of the seed which is the kingdom (ie. the knowledge of the mystery of the kingdom),⁽³⁾ it is also found in Mt.11.27 (cf. Lk.10.22) referring to Jesus' receiving from God teaching which

(1) Theology I. p.43.

(2) The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings. pp.9-16.

(3) Cf. Mt.13.11; Lk.8.10; Mt.13.52.

he in turn reveals to whom he will; finally this verb appears in Mt.25.14,20,22 to denote the receiving of the talents which represent the teaching of Jesus. Παραλαμβάνειν is not found in the Synoptic Gospels but several other verbs are used to express the idea of receiving the tradition of Jesus.⁽¹⁾ The least that can be deduced from the foregoing is that the composers of these three Gospels were at home with the idea that Jesus intended that his testimony should be learned and preserved, that he in fact committed it to his disciples. "The words and deeds of Jesus are a holy Word, comparable with that of the Old Testament, and the handing down of this precious material is entrusted to special persons."⁽²⁾ "The beginning of the Gospel tradition lies with Jesus himself."⁽³⁾ "In view of the Old Testament background and the Messianic hopes of the Jews, we can legitimately assume that Jesus entrusted to his disciples, and hence to the eschatological People of God an already formulated holy Word for it to transmit and that this was the starting point of a tradition."⁽⁴⁾

(1) Δέχεσθαι is used absolutely in Mt.11.14 and in the explanation of the parable of the sower it is used for the receiving of the word (Lk.8.13) - this is in line with LXX usage; cf. Dt. 33.3; Prov.2.1; 10.8; Zeph.3.2,7; Jer.17.23; δέχεσθαι appears again in Mk.10.15; Lk.18.17 for the receiving of the kingdom (ie. the knowledge of the mystery of the kingdom - compare Mk.4.11 and Mt.13.11). The simple λαμβάνεσθαι occurs in Mt.13.20; Mk.4.16 to denote the receiving of the word (cf. Prov.8.10; Jer.42.13). Παραδέχεσθαι is used by Mark for receiving the word (4.20; cf. Ac.22.18) where it is used for receiving the μαρτυρία).

(2) Riesenfeld, op. cit., pp.20f; cf. Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, esp. pp.221f. and 244.

(3) Riesenfeld, op. cit., p.23.

(4) Riesenfeld, op. cit., p.29.

Riesenfeld's thesis is supported by the following considerations taken from the sources: Jesus is concerned that his disciples should have a complete grasp of his teaching; they are to take heed what they hear (Mk.4.24) and his words - words about his death and rising (Lk.9.44f; cf. Mt.17.22f; Mk.9.30-32) - are to sink down in their ears; he thanks God for having hidden the teaching which he had delivered to himself from the wise and prudent and for revealing them to children (Lk.10.21f.).⁽¹⁾ In the first place he chose twelve men to be his disciples and to be with him, that is to attend to his teaching, that he might send them out to preach (Mk. 3.14). Indeed he envisages people saying to him later: "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name" (Mt.7.22) and claims that although heaven and earth will pass away yet his words will remain (Mt.24.35). In the accounts of the commissioning of the twelve in Mt. and Mk. it is significant that the only specific instructions Jesus gives concerning their activities has to do with teaching or testifying (Mt.10.1ff., par.). The disciples are expected to understand Jesus' parables; it is given to them to know the mysteries of the kingdom (Mt.13.11, par.), to them are to be given the keys of the kingdom (Mt.16.19) which the lawyers have taken away (Lk.11.52) and every scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like a householder who brings forth out of his treasury ⁽²⁾ things new and old (Mt. 13.51f.). Mary, who listened attentively to Jesus' words,

(1) This passage has obvious connections with Ps.18.8: ὁ νόμος τοῦ κυρίου ἄμωρος, ἐπιστεφὼν ψυχάς· ἡ μαρτυρία κυρίου πιστή, σοφίζουσα νήπια and Ps. 118.129: Θαυμάστὰ τὰ μαρτύριά σου· διὰ τοῦτο ἐξηρξέυνησεν αὐτὰ ἡ ψυχὴ μου. ἡ δῆλωσις τῶν λόγων σου φωτιεῖ καὶ συνετιεῖ νηπίους. It is to be noted that in these verses μαρτυρία and μαρτύριον refer to the same thing, viz. the torah of God.

(2) Cf. Lk.12.3: "What ye have spoken in the ear in the treasures (ταμείοις) will be proclaimed on the housetops."

is commended for choosing the good part which will not be taken from her (Lk.10.42).⁽¹⁾

The teaching of Jesus has to be passed on by those who hear and believe.⁽²⁾ What Jesus tells the disciples in darkness they are to speak in light (Mt.10.27) and what they have spoken in the ear in store-rooms will be proclaimed on the house-tops (Lk.12.3). Jesus speaks to the crowds in parables which he expounds in private to the disciples (Mk.4.34³) and they are forbidden to give his holy teaching to dogs⁽³⁾ or to cast their pearls before swine (Mt.7.6); they are also to beware of the leaven or teaching of the Pharisees (Mt.16.12). Jesus contrasts the prophets, wise men and scribes whom he sends (ἀποστέλλειν) with the scribes and Pharisees who omit the weightier matters of the torah and witness to themselves that they are the sons of those who murdered the prophets (Mt. 23.34, 23.31). All this shows that the disciples were carefully taught the new torah of the kingdom by Jesus that they in turn might have a store of doctrine from which to draw for their mission to the world.⁽⁴⁾ In the parable of the talents it is clear that these talents are the message which Jesus delivered

(1) This, according to Gerhardsson (*op. cit.*, p.241) "is a doctrinal passage which fills the function of showing the task which, according to Jesus, must be the most important for his followers, that of listening to the word of the Lord."

(2) Rengstorff, (*KWB*.IV.458.37f.) asserts that in the Gospels the disciples of Jesus do not appear as the bearers of his tradition but as his witnesses, but there is sufficient evidence in OT and NT to show that the witness is the teacher or bearer of tradition.

(3) Cf. Is.56.10f., Phil.3.2; Rev. 22.15 and a reference to the opposite kind of custodian in II Tim.2.2; Prov.9.9f.

(4) Lindsay (*The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, p.102) has laid too much emphasis on a kind of spiritual intuition on the part of the prophets of the early Church and he speaks as if the Christian faith was entirely distinguished from everything Jewish.

(παρέδωκεν) to his servants who, if they are faithful, will trade with them (ἐργάζεσθαι) ⁽¹⁾ (Mt.25.14-16; cf. Lk.19.11-28).

In Luke's account of the parable of the teaching ministry the servants who were faithful were given a (teaching) authority (ἐξουσία) over cities (Lk.19.17) and in the parable of the faithful and wise steward (Mt.24.45-51; Lk.12.42-46) there is an obvious reference to a tradition coming directly from the Lord who presumably supplies the 'meat', especially in view of the preceding statement by Jesus concerning the Gospel of the kingdom which is to be preached in all the world εἰς μαρτύριον to all nations (Mt.24.14), the association of τέρεφν with doctrine (Heb.5.12,14; cf. Mt.16.5f.) and the use of παρατίθεσθαι in Lk.12.48.

After his resurrection Jesus expounds to the disciples the things in all the scriptures about himself (Lk.24.27,44-47), again, presumably, that they may preach and teach others, as is shown by Lk.24.47f. and Mt.28.19f.

(1) Ἐργάτης is used of "those who as teachers labour to propagate and promote Christianity among men: II Cor.11.13; Phil.3.2; II Tim.2.15." (Grimm-Thayer, p.248a); cf. Iren. 2.121.1; Tert. ad Marc.4.24; cf. Gerhardsson, (op. cit., pp.241f.) where the connection between industry and the study of the torah is noted.

Conclusion

The above gives some grounds for concluding that Jesus, being well aware of the content of the OT testimony and its neglect by the leaders of the people of God, saw himself as the fulfilment of it. His authority was prophetic and depended on his teaching, belief in which cannot be forced since it is a spiritual gift. Jesus' authority then is a teaching authority which he has by virtue of his possession of the true testimony and his being a true and faithful bearer of it; his doctrine is his interpretation of the torah or testimony already given in 'Moses and the prophets', an interpretation which is given by word and parabolic action. It has also been shown that Jesus gave his disciples a clearly defined body of doctrine which they committed to memory and that he expected them to pass on his testimony to others.

CHAPTER VIIITHE TESTIMONY OF JESUS IN THE FOURTH GOSPELThe Nature of the Testimony

That Jesus' testimony is his teaching comes out very clearly in the third chapter of the Fourth Gospel.⁽¹⁾ Nicodemus the Pharisee, the teacher of Israel recognises Jesus as a teacher and the latter says at one point: ἀμην ἀμην λέγω σοι ὅτι ὃ οἶδαμεν λαλοῦμεν καὶ ὃ ἐώρακαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἡμῶν οὐ λαμβάνετε (3.11).⁽²⁾ This idea is repeated by the author in 3.32f: ὃ ἐώρακεν καὶ ἤκουσεν, τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ, καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς λαμβάνει. The Jews do not receive his word because they do not receive the word of God, the co-witness of Jesus. The Lord admits that if he is concerned only for his own honour (this is the meaning of 5.31: Ἐὰν ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, ἡ μαρτυρία μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής.) his testimony is not trustworthy but the message is of such a kind that only God can attest it: ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὃ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμοῦ, καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἀληθής ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία ἣν μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ (5.32. cf. 8.18); not even John the Baptist can do so: ὑμεῖς ἀπεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ· ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου τὴν μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνω. (5.33f.).⁽³⁾

(1) Von Campenhausen with many others regards the Johannine use of the witness-concept as different to that of Luke (*Idee*, p.33).

(2) The repeated ἀμην indicates that this is a word of Jesus and the plural includes past prophets and future apostles (with Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp.232f.)

(3) Cf. Paul's similar statement in Gal.1.11f.

The Lord's testimony to what he knows and has 'seen' and 'heard' cannot be described as eye-witness testimony in the commonly-accepted sense for what he testifies is the counsel of God in its earthly context although he is able to discourse on heavenly things too (3.12; cf. Sap.9.13,16)). Bultmann in his commentary on John's Gospel denies (p.103) that this testimony (3.11) is about 'things' or 'events' of which he was eye- or ear-witness, but this, of course, is a misleading generalisation; a correct phrasing would be: "not merely about 'things'....." What Jesus testifies is revelation but this must remain veiled for no man can see God and live (1.18). Jesus testified as the OT prophets did and his authority is similar to theirs who taught the truth of the God with whom Jesus claimed to be one.⁽¹⁾ Jesus claims that the works he does are God's testimony about him because he has been sent by God: τὰ γὰρ ἔργα ἃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ Πατήρ...μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι ὁ Πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν. καὶ ὁ πέμψας με Πατήρ, ἐκεῖνος μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ ἐμοῦ. (5.36f.cf.10.25; τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Πατρὸς μου, ταῦτα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ.) ; the scriptures also bear witness to the truth as it is in Jesus: καὶ ἐκεῖναί ἐστιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ (5.39). In the above statements Jesus himself is the content of the testimony; the testimony of God, the works and the scriptures are Jesus' testimony although he can describe it as 'περὶ ἐμοῦ'.

(1) Cf. Asting (*Die Verkündigung*, p.690), who notes correctly that Jesus' testimony concerns not what he knew in his pre-existence but what he has seen and heard in his life together with the Father during his earthly existence.

The world hates Jesus because he testifies of it that its works are evil: ἔγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ αὐτοῦ κτλ. (7.7). The Pharisees reject Jesus' testimony because it is invalid on legal grounds. Σὺ περὶ σεαυτοῦ μαρτυρεῖς· ἡ μαρτυρία σου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής. (8.13) but their argument from Jesus' point of view is invalid since his testimony, by its very nature, is not susceptible of legal proof: Κἀν ἔγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ ἑμαυτοῦ, ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία μου, ὅτι οἶδα πόθεν ἦλθον (8.14). They judge according to the flesh, i.e. in terms of the eye-witness testimony of Dt. 17.6; 19.15 but Jesus, while seeming to submit to this, (vv. 17f.) really adduces only one other witness at this point, viz. the Father, which certainly would not meet the case as far as the Pharisees were concerned. In the final issue Jesus can produce only one witness, himself, for he cannot show them the Father except in himself, in what he does and says⁽¹⁾ (v.19).

In 13.21 these words occur: Ἰησοῦς ἑταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἑμαρτύρησεν καὶ εἶπεν, Ἀμην ἀμην λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με. For Bernard⁽²⁾ ἑμαρτύρησεν is used for "an explicit and definite pronouncement" of Jesus. It is possible to take this further and arrive at the content of the pronouncement by remembering that Jesus is aware of having come into the world to testify to or by the truth (18.37: εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ).

(1) See above p. 28, note 6. Lightfoot's view (St. John's Gospel, p. 146, note 1) that the requirement of two witnesses is satisfied when Jesus is glorified and the Holy Spirit joins his testimony to that of the disciples would not have satisfied his enemies and in fact did not, as is learned from Acts 4.

(2) St. John, ICC, p. 470.

and that for him the truth is the testimony of the scriptures,⁽¹⁾ ie. himself. There are several psalms whose thought may well lie behind the passage but especially Ps.54 where the writer says:

ἐταράχθην ἀπὸ φωνῆς ἐχθροῦ (vv.3f.).....

ἐβεβήλωσαν τὴν διαθήκην αὐτοῦ (v.21).....

ἡ καρδία μου ἐταράχθη (v.5). Then there is

the reference to betrayal by a friend (vv.13f.)⁽²⁾ followed by

the significant expressions: διηγέσομαι⁽³⁾ and ἐπαγγελάω

⁽⁴⁾ (v.18). Other psalms with a somewhat similar pattern are 6.3f.;76 where the writer is troubled (v.5), then he remembers God and his works, especially his creative and redemptive works (vv.5,12-16) and Ps.142.4f. It is thus possible to think of Jesus teaching his disciples at the meal and showing them how the scriptures are to be fulfilled in himself. It is an assumption to say that εἶπεν repeats ἐμαρτύρησεν and that therefore the words αὐτὸς κτλ. are the content of ἐμαρτύρησεν⁽⁵⁾; the fact that all three verbs are separated by the emphatic καὶ καὶ shows that ἐμαρτύρησεν is used absolutely.

(1) II, Esd.9.13-26; Ps.24.5,10; 118.30f.,43,46 etc. and especially 138: ἐνετείλω δικαιοσύνην τὰ μαρτύριά σου καὶ ἀλήθειαν σφόδρα.

(2) The friend who is really an enemy is given the ψωμίον cf. Prov.25.21: Ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν..

(3) = κηρύσσειν in Lk.8.39,cf.1.1 where διήγησις is used for the setting forth of the Gospel narratives. See also Euseb. 3.24.7; 3.39.12.

(4) One of the NT technical terms for preaching or teaching and = μαρτυρεῖν in I Jn.1.2. In Ac.26.20 ἀπαγγέλλειν is used of the preaching of Paul the ὑπηρέτης and μαρτυρ (26.16). "The 'testimony' of iii.11 is that of Christ, but, as occasionally elsewhere, the evangelist betrays the fact that it is mediated corporately by the Church". (Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p.328, note 3). This testimony, according to Paul, is precisely that of Moses and the prophets.

(5) Günther's emphasis on the apocalyptic connotation of the witness-concept re-appears in this connection (Μάρτυς, pp. 136f.) but while it is correct to say that there is some

According to St. John the testimony of Jesus is equivalent to his doctrine (cf. 8.2 and 13).⁽¹⁾ Nicodemus addresses him as $\rho\alpha\beta\beta\epsilon\iota$ which John takes to be the Hebrew for $\delta\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ (20.16). In chapter 6 Jesus, echoing Wisdom's invitation to her feast (Prov. 9.1-6) calls himself the true bread from heaven who imparts the teaching of God (v. 45)⁽²⁾ about the good life (v. 27). He is reported as teaching in the temple (7.14, 28; 8.2; 18.20) the things his Father had taught him (7.16f; 8.28; cf. 15.15). Martha calls him $\delta\ \Delta\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ (11.28) and the disciples call him $\Delta\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (13.13f.). At the trial the high priest asks him about his disciples and his doctrine ($\delta\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\chi\eta$). This testimony is described in different ways: it is the word of God (5.38), the words of eternal life (6.68). Jesus speaks in parables (10.1-6) and proverbs (16.25, 29; cf. 10.24); his teachings are also commandments (14.15; I Jn. 2.3, 7), the new torah (13.34). The action of testifying is called 'declaring' or 'interpreting' God (1.18), manifesting God's name (17.6), talking of heavenly

reference to judgement in the content of the testimony there can be no doubt that the idea goes right back into the roots of the OT.

(1) Friedrich (KWB. III 702.22-29) points out correctly that $\kappa\eta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$ and $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ are not found in the Johannine writings with the exception of Rev. 5.2; 14.6 but it must be admitted that $\alpha\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ (I Jn. 1.2) and $\alpha\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ (I Jn. 1.5) are used of the testimony and in Nah. 2.1 $\alpha\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ and $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ are closely parallel. It is true that John prefers $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$ to $\kappa\eta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$.

(2) ie. the life-giving bread offered by wisdom; cf. Is. 55.10; Sir. 15.3. That the Proverbs passage lies behind the thought of this chapter is confirmed by the statement that God has sealed Jesus, for a person ordering a banquet gave his seal (in Jesus' case the Spirit) to the servant or steward commissioned to supply it (Dods, The Expositor's Greek Testament, I.p.752.)

things (3.12), providing living water (4.10)⁽¹⁾, declaring the truth of God (8.32,40,45f; 17.17,19; 18.37), providing with the meat which endures to everlasting life (6.27 etc.) and all this may be summed up as God's work (ἐργον).

The Content of the Testimony

Jesus' testimony is what he knows and has seen (3.11); it is Jesus himself, the Son of God;⁽²⁾ it contains the four main principles already noted.⁽³⁾ (a) The sovereignty of God, of his word by which all things were made and the lordship of Jesus are stressed; the world was made by him (1.10), Jesus manifested his glory (2.11); he taught about the kingdom of God

(1) Cf. Is.41.17f; 49.10; 58.11; Prov.13.14.

(2) Cf. Strathmann (KWB. IV.503.4ff) and Schechter (Aspects, p.127) describes Torah as "the sum total of the contents of revelation, a revelation and a promise, the expression of the will of God which is identified with the wisdom of Prov.8.

(3) Yet Bultmann (Theology.II.p.66) can write: "John in his Gospel presents only the fact (das Dass) of the Revelation without describing its content (ihr Was)."

Dodd is hardly correct when he states (The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p.82): "he (the evangelist) draws an explicit contrast between Christianity and the Torah, regarding the latter as superseded by the former." The contrast is rather between the work of Moses as God's instrument for imparting the Torah to Israel and Jesus who was himself the Torah which he taught. Dodd quotes Midr.Ps. on Ps.25.10(Heb.): "Grace: that means God's acts of love; truth: that means Torah." Again, on p.175, Dodd states: "χάρις and ἀλήθεια in Christ are contrasted with νόμος". It is perhaps better to take ἡ χάρις καὶ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο, as meaning the same as ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (1.14).

(3.3), made himself equal with God (5.18,23) and claimed to have existed before Abraham (8.58). He was accused by the Jews of making himself God and this he did not deny (10.33); indeed he says that whoever has seen him has seen the Father (14.7-9); he claims to have a kingdom although it is not of this world (18.36). (b) Jesus' emphasis on the moral law is just as strong as that of his fellow-Jews but while they honoured the law for the sake of the letter he was concerned more for the welfare of the human beings for whom God had given the law; he is prepared to break the sabbath law in order to do God's work and advises his critics to be just in their judgement (7.24). Sin, for Jesus, is hatred of himself and God (15.24) and he sums up the moral law in the new commandment: "Love one another". (13.34, 15.12,17). (c) Jesus links his own redemptive action with the events of the Exodus in the reference to the serpent being lifted up in the desert (3.14f; cf.16.32f.) and the manna being sent down from heaven (6.31f.). God sent his son into the world that the world through him might be saved (3.17). The healing miracles which Jesus does are the works of God and they are God's testimony that he has sent Jesus (5.36). In many passages Jesus speaks of the salvation which is through himself and his work (10.9, 11; 12.47 etc.). The high priest unwittingly prophesies that Jesus is the one man who is to die for the nation (11.51). Jesus' sacrificial death is a glorifying of himself and God (13.31). (d) The promise of life to those who turn to God and doom to those who turn away from his offer plays a large part here also, being represented sometimes as a present reality, sometimes as lying in the future (5.28f; 6.39f; 6.54; 9.39).⁽¹⁾

(1) The above shows the weakness of Günther's statement: "Der Inhalt dieses 'Zeugnisses' ist nicht das was war, die Auferstehung, sondern das was kommen wird, das Gericht." (ZNW.47.

The significant feature of Jesus' testimony as John reports it is the way in which he fulfils it in his own person; he is the word, the torah of God, the way, the truth and the life; he is the witness⁽¹⁾ and the testimony; he is the event which 'carries' the truth; he is the truth behind the event; whoever has seen him has seen the Father (12.45; 14.9) for the Father and he are one. He embodies the lordship of God, he fulfils all righteousness, he dies for the salvation of the world and all judgement has been given into his hands (5.19-24). "The power of the Gospel to overcome our unbelief depends on the fact that the kerygma includes the Gospels with their concrete picture of Jesus.....in which we lay hold of the character of God."⁽²⁾

The Authority of the Witness

In the Fourth Gospel Jesus is shown as the fulfilment of the prophecies in Is.40-65: he is the tabernacle of the word where the glory of God was seen (1.14);⁽³⁾ he is the true vine, the ideal Israel, greater even than Jacob-Israel himself (4.12-14), greater than Abraham (8.53,56,58), greater than Moses (1.17; 6.32) for he is the king of Israel (12.13). Jesus claims that God is his Father (5.18), that he and the Father are one (10.30), thus making himself God (10.33), that the Father dwells in him (14.10), that everything that the Father has is his (16.15), that he was before Abraham (8.58), that he shared God's glory before the world was (17.5). Israel in her prophets and

(1956), p.154). G. has avoided the difficulty presented by Polycarp: Ad Phil. 7.1f. by taking μαρτύριον = martyrdom and τοῦ σταυροῦ as subj.gen. and ignoring 7.2: ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡμῶν παραδοθέντα λόγον ἐπιστρέψωμεν... (ib.p.156).

(1) Michel (Prophet und Märtyrer, p.50) attributes the non-appearance of μάρτυς in the Fourth Gospel as a sign that by this time it means martyr and that its author had not yet died, but the argument from silence is precarious.

(2) Althaus: The So-called Kerygma, p.45.

(3) Cf. Num. 14.10: καὶ ἡ δόξα κυρίου ᾤφθη ἐν νεφέλῃ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ.

righteous men has 'seen' and 'heard' God but only Jesus has seen him in any real sense (1.18; 3.11-13,32; 5.19,30). Because of this Jesus knows God (8.55; 16.30). He is conscious of having been sent with God's authority but this is an authority which because of its nature can have no credentials or sanctions other than love; failure to honour the son means failure to honour the Father who has sent him (5.23; cf. 12.44);⁽¹⁾ he has come in the Father's name (5.43) to do the will of God (6.38). The Jews are amazed at Jesus' learning and ask: "How does this man know letters, never having learned?", to which Jesus replies: "My doctrine is not mine but his who sent me." (7.15f.). Jesus claims to have power (ἐξουσία) but this is not temporal, it is power to execute judgement (5.27), power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as God has given him (17.2f; cf. 6.68), that is to say, it is a teaching authority to teach the true righteousness (cf. Sap.15.3). Jesus' authority is vouched for by the scriptures (5.39,46) and by the works which he does (2.23; 3.2; 5.36);⁽²⁾ 9.16,33; 10.25,38; 14.11; 15.24; cf. Ac. 2.22).

(1) Πέμπειν and ἀποστέλλειν are used interchangeably (eg. 7.28f.) in the Fourth Gospel for God's sending Jesus. Ἀπόστολος does not occur except in 13.16 where it simply means 'a messenger'.

(2) Cf. Asting (Die Verkündigung, p.679): "Gottes Offenbarung, indem sie in die Welt hineintritt, Jesus als ihren Inhalt hat. Jesu Stellung ist durch dieser Offenbarung ganz und gar bestimmt. Aber deshalb ist auch Jesu göttliche Autorität gerade durch die Offenbarung gegeben." Burnier (La Notion de Témoignage, p.56), says correctly: "le mot de témoignage, dans ces passages de Jean (5.31-39; 8.12-20; 1 Jn.5.6-12), correspond véritablement à une conception particulière de l'autorité de Jésus" but he has already begun at the wrong end in this matter of authority: "Ce qui fait l'autorité d'un témoignage, c'est la personne du témoin." (p.54) and "il est évident que dans l'expression le témoignage de Jésus il est question du témoignage rendu par Jésus et non du témoignage rendu à Jésus." (p.55). The best way to put this is that the testimony of Jesus is the testimony about Jesus borne by Jesus and later by his disciples. Burnier has said (p.56) that the word testimony has nothing specific about it in these

Bultmann's comment on 5.31f. is apposite: he says that the world is wrong to ask for acceptable evidence for Jesus' claim which is that of a "revealer" for this would mean a "Kontinuität zwischen Menschlichem und Göttlichen. Nur (solches) direkte Wissen (5.32) des Offenbarers, nicht die Berufung auf allgemein anerkannte Kriterien, versichert die Wahrheit des Zeugnisses."⁽¹⁾

The Authority of the Testimony

The knowledge which Jesus imparts is the real source of his authority; this testimony is a spiritual gift for God has not given the spirit by measure to him who speaks the words of God (3.34); although not given the actual name it is a charisma which is not limited and which abides in those who believe (5.38; 14.16). Everyone who is taught by God comes to Jesus (6.45; cf. Mt.11.28f.: "Come to me all who work (κοπιῶντες) ... take my yoke upon you and learn from me," but no man can come unless he is permitted by God (6.65). Jesus' teaching is not a gift which comes and goes; it remains a perennial spring (4.14). In sum, Jesus is himself the torah⁽²⁾ and the truth he reveals must be received on the ground of testimony which can only be verified, as it were, from within.⁽³⁾

passages and that the emphasis never falls on it but if someone testifies there is a testimony and the testimony is the important factor, it is the subject, aim and object of the testifying. B. understands the word testimony in a restrictive sense: "un témoignage n'est que le récit d'un fait, non ce fait même; il n'est que la proclamation d'une vérité, non la substance de cette vérité." (p.57) and continues on p.59: "Ce témoignage de Dieu est donné par le fait de la présence de Dieu lui-même dans l'existence de Jésus." But it must be said that this fact was not a visible, concrete fact, visible to all men. It was and is something that has always been the subject of testimony, even on the part of Jesus himself for even he had doubts and temptations all through his life.

(1) Das Evangelium des Johannes, p.198.

(2) Cf. Ostborn, Tora in the Old Testament, p.161.

(3) Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel, p.117.

The testimony of Jesus has no irresistible sanction; its acceptance depends on faith in the hearer: the world was made by him and the world knew him not. He came to his own and his own received him not. The miracles or signs which Jesus does persuade some (2.11) but have no such effect on others (5.16) and so he does not depend on human eye-witness testimony, not even on that of John the Baptist (5.33f.). Many of the Samaritans believed for the saying of the woman who testified and many because of Jesus' own word (4.39-42). If the Jews had believed Moses they would have believed Jesus (5.46f.) but they do not hear God's words, ie. the truth which Jesus speaks, because they are not of God (8.45-47), they are not of Jesus' fold (10.26). The disciples have received Jesus' words and have known surely that Jesus came out from God and have believed that God sent him (17.8) and everyone who is of the truth hears Jesus' voice which witnesses to the truth (18.37). Jesus' only witness is God who testifies through the scriptures and his works, for Jesus testifies spiritual things.⁽¹⁾ He is the revelation of God; his words are "a concrete authority with a singular aliveness of its own."⁽²⁾

(1) Bultmann is right in saying: "the man called to have faith can ask for no credentials, no legitimation, no 'testimony' (μαρτυρία) to the validity of the word of the Revelation" (Theology, II, p.68) but at the same time it must be recognised that the early church spoke a great deal about witnesses and witnessing and testimony; a life had been lived, actions had been performed, words had been spoken. The life, the actions and the words themselves testify, that is they point men to and remind men of God. It is when the biblical testimony is thought of in a legal way that difficulty enters.
 (2) Barth, Church Dogmatics. Vol. I. Part I. pp.118f.

The Transmission of the Testimony

Not a great deal is made of the transmission of the testimony of Jesus in this Gospel but the idea is present to the mind of the author: Jesus calls disciples who live with him and receive his teaching (1.38-51) and he encourages the Jews who believe in him to continue in his word (8.31); he says that his sheep hear his voice and follow him, ie. receive his teaching, and he gives them eternal life (10.27f.). He speaks of the way in which, after his death, the Holy Spirit will teach the disciples and bring to their remembrance everything he has said to them (14.26; 16.12-15). He calls his disciples not servants but friends for he has made known to them everything that he has heard from the Father (15.15).⁽¹⁾ He teaches his disciples that they may remember his words when he is taken from them (16.4) and he gives them the words God has given him; these they have received and kept (17.8,6,14). All this is that they may be one, which would include their presenting a common testimony.⁽²⁾

Conclusion

It is in fact Jesus' testimony which invests him with authority. The only commissioning which could in any way be connected with a 'succession' is his baptism at the hand of John, this might be called a kind of prophetic succession but Jesus himself never claimed any rights from it; he simply

(1) Cf. Gen.18.17-19 where the LORD says: "Shall I hide from Abraham the thing which I do.....? For I know him, that he... and his household....shall keep the way of the LORD," Abraham was known as the friend of God (ὁ φίλος τοῦ Θεοῦ, Is. 41.8).

(2) Cf. Diem, Ev. Theol., 1 (1934/35), pp.427f.

inferred that his authority was the same as that of the Baptist. His authority is that of the witness of God who proclaims the truth of God concerning His nature, demand, redemption and final victory. It is impossible to conceive of Jesus passing on to others an authority divorced from the message he brought. While he lived he himself had no authority other than that which he claimed to have received by virtue of his having been sent by God as a witness or prophet or teacher. The fact that he pointed to himself as the embodiment and fulfilment of the doctrine did not make his message any less dependent on faith in the hearer than that of the prophets who went before him; his life is a sign in which the truth may or may not be 'seen'. Whatever authority he had was recognised only by those who recognised the authority of God which had already been set forth in the scriptures by the earlier witnesses. Certainly, in the former dispensation, there had been a hereditary priesthood whose duty it was to preserve and present the testimony to successive generations but this 'succession' was, as often as not, unfaithful to the testimony and had to be rebuked and corrected by the prophets, the witnesses sent by God, who 'saw' the truth and whose authority was simply the truth of the words they spoke and their own obedience to the fundamental principles of the torah. In the same way there will always be the necessity for an official teaching office in the church but at all times this office must always be willing to listen to the voice of prophecy and test both the prophecy and its own teaching by the testimony of the law, the prophets, the psalmists, Jesus and the apostles.

CHAPTER IXOTHER TESTIMONY IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS1. The Disciples⁽¹⁾ of JesusThe Nature of the Testimony

There are two parallel sets of passages in the Synoptic Gospels in which the evangelising activity of the Twelve is described as a μαρτύριον . The first of these is the account of their commissioning by Jesus (Mt.10.1ff, par.) and the second is the apocalyptic discourse of Jesus (Mt.24.1ff, par.). In the first passage Jesus sends⁽²⁾ the disciples to proclaim the nearness of the kingdom of heaven to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; where they are not received they are to shake off the dust of their feet; it is this 'shaking' action which Mark and Luke say is εἰς μαρτύριον⁽³⁾ but Matthew reads: "And ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake εἰς μαρτύριον to them and the Gentiles" and adds: "It shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak but the Spirit of your Father which

(1) Cf. Rengstorff (KWB.IV.454.4-11) for an appreciation of the difficulty of separating the Disciples, the Twelve and the Apostles and M. Barth (Der Augenzeuge, p.170) for the difficulty of deciding the exact number of apostles. If, as is generally believed, the Twelve represent all Israel it may equally be said that they are representative apostles but as such they have no authority over the other apostles who bear the same testimony. Reid's judgement must be agreed with: "The appointment of the Twelve was of the things that pass because its original purpose was fulfilled." (The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry, p.12). Rengstorff (Apostleship, p.33) shows that there is no need to identify the Twelve and the Apostles.

(2) The apostle in the NT is not to be associated with the rabbinic נָבִיא but with the OT prophet whose prophesying was called testifying. Cf. Rigaux: (Thessaloniens, pp.157f.): "L'apostolat chrétien a pris la place du prophétisme juif."

(3) Casey (The Beginnings of Christianity, V.p.31) says "this is a witness against the enemies of the Gospel." cf. Schmidt: Markus, p.189.

"speaketh in you" (Mt.10.5-20).⁽¹⁾ In the second set of passages there is a similar forecast of sufferings which are to come about for Jesus' name's sake, that is on account of preaching him openly, and then the Lord says: "This gospel of the kingdom shall be proclaimed in all the world εἰς παντὺς τοὺς αἰῶνες to all nations" (Mt.24.9-14); Mark's account foretells the appearance of the disciples before rulers and kings εἰς παντὺς τοὺς αἰῶνες⁽²⁾ and continues by way of amplification: "And the gospel must first be published among all nations" (Mk.13.9f.). Luke uses a slightly altered expression: ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς παντὺς τοὺς αἰῶνες (21.13), which means the same thing.

While it is possible to interpret the shaking off of the dust in terms of the Jewish ritual which signified the putting off of defilement contracted by passing through Gentile territory⁽³⁾ there is also some justification for seeing in this a deliberate didactic action influenced by the thought of the Mishnah tractate Aboth 1.4: "Jose b. Joezer said: 'Let thy house be a meeting-house for the sages and sit amidst the dust of their feet and drink in their words with thirst' ".⁽⁴⁾ The

(1) Reitzenstein (Hermes 52(1917), p.444) gives the meaning of εἰς παντὺς τοὺς αἰῶνες as: "um dereinst Zeugnis gegen sie abzulegen, dass Jesu Namen ihnen wirklich verkündet sei." but his 'gegen' has no counterpart in the Greek. He continues: "Der Jünger erscheint hier als Gesandter Gottes oder Jesu; nimmt das Volk die Botschaft nicht an, so werde er Zeuge wider es".

(2) Cf. Ac.9.15. Ps.118.46 gives the strongest grounds for believing that the reference is to the new teaching of Jesus which fulfils the testimony of the psalmist. "They were to stand there to testify to Jesus." (Gould, St. Mark. ICC. p.245).

(3) As Str/Bill. (Vol. I.p.571). Strathmann (KWB. IV.509.6-8) sees the action as 'Beleustungszeugnis' at the Day of Judgement; cf. Schniewind: Markus, p.59.

(4) The Babylonian Talmud (ed.I. Epstein), note (7) on Aboth 1.4 explains it as: "Either: let the dust of the feet of the sages, as they walk, cover you (i.e., follow them closely), or, sit in the dust (on the ground) at their feet whilst they teach."

connection between Mt. 10.14 and 18 established by Lk. 9.5 makes it fairly certain that the μαρτύριον referred to is the preaching and teaching which the disciples are to deliver at every opportunity, even at their trial. Further, there is an incident in II Esd. which also throws some light on this passage. The nobles and princes had promised to restore their pledges to the people to whom they had been lending money and to stop exacting usury and Nehemiah says: καὶ τὴν ἀναβολὴν μου ἐξετίναξα καὶ εἶπα Ὅτως ἐκτινάξαι ὁ θεὸς πάντα ἄνδρα, ὃς οὐ στήσει τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ κόπου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσται οὕτως ἐκτετιναγμένος καὶ κενός. (II Esd. 15.13). Thus, it might be possible to interpret the shaking of the dust as a threat and link this passage with Ac. 18.6 where Paul shook his raiment and said to the opposing and blaspheming Jews in Corinth: "Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean." Nevertheless the reference in Acts is probably rather to Ezek. 3.18 showing that Paul regards himself as clean because he has spoken God's word.

The OT passage which shows the most striking similarities with the sections under review is Isaiah 51 and 52 as will be seen here:

Isaiah

51.4 (cf. 52.18): ἀκούσατέ μου ἀκούσατε, λαός μου, καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς, πρὸς με ἐνωτίσασθε ὅτι νόμος παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ ἡ κείστις μου εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν

51.7: ἀκούσατέ μου, οἱ εἰδότες κείσιν, λαός μου οὗ ὁ νόμος μου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν· μὴ φοβεῖσθε

Synoptics

Mat. 10.18: καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν

Lk. 6.22f: μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν

IsaiahSynoptics

ὀνειδισμόν ἀνθρώπων καὶ
τῷ φαλισμῷ αὐτῶν μὴ
ἡττᾶσθε.

51.16: Θήσω τοὺς λόγους
μου εἰς τὸ στόμα σου.

52.1: οὐκέτι προστεθήσεται
διελθεῖν διὰ σοῦ
ἀπερίτμητος καὶ
ἀκάθαρτος.

52.2: ἐκτίναξαι τὸν χοῦν.

52.3: Δωρεὰν ἐπράθητε
καὶ οὐ μετὰ ἀγευεῖου
λυτρωθήσεσθε.

52.6: διὰ τοῦτο γινώσεται
ὁ λαὸς μου τὸ ὄνομα
μου ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
ἐκείνῃ, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι
αὐτὸς ὁ λαλῶν.

52.7: ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου
ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης.

52.7: λέγων Σιών Βασιλεύσει
σου ὁ Θεός.

τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν
ἐνεκα τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
χάσεται ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

Lk.21.15: ἐγὼ γὰρ δώσω ὑμῖν
στόμα καὶ σοφίαν.

Mk.6.7: καὶ ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς
ἔξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων
τῶν ἀκαθάρτων. (ἐπὶ πάντα
τὰ δαιμόνια. (Lk.9.1))

Mk.6.11: ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν.

Mat.10.8f: δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε
δωρεὰν δότε. Μὴ κτήσησθε
χρυσὸν μηδὲ ἀγνεον.

Lk.21.12,15: ἀπαγομένους ἐπὶ
βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας
ἐνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος μου
... ἐγὼ γὰρ δώσω ὑμῖν
στόμα. Mt.10.6: πορεύεσθε..
πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα.. οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ.

Mt.10.13: ἐλθάτω ἡ εἰρήνη
ὑμῶν ἐπ' αὐτήν.

Mt.10.7: κηρύσσετε λέγοντες
ὅτι Ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία
τῶν οὐρανῶν.

It is hard to believe that Jesus did not have this section of Isaiah in mind and if this is the case then it would appear that the shaking off of the dust for a μαρτύριον, the expressing of the gospel, the publishing of peace, the message of the reign of God are different ways of describing the preaching and teaching work of the disciples who are now Israel⁽¹⁾ (Is. 51.4,16), the servant and witness of God (Is.43.10,12; 44.8).⁽¹⁾ This may also be seen in the influence of Ps.118.46 (καὶ ἐλάλουν ἐν τοῖς μαρτυρίοις σου ἐναντίον βασιλέων καὶ οὐκ ἡσυχνόμην) on Mt.10.18 since in the psalm the μαρτύριον always refers to the torah or teaching about God; this is important, not because it establishes the unbelievers' guilt but simply because it is the word of God.⁽²⁾

(1) Schlatter (Märtyrer, pp.245f.) and others see a martyr - reference here, without any reason given. Rigaux (Thessaloniens, p.635; cf. von Dobschütz: Die Thessalonicher-Briefe, Exkurs zu I.2.2, pp.86 and 252) gives instances in the Pauline Epistles where μαρτύριον is synonymous with εὐαγγέλιον, κήρυγμα and διδασκαλία but his omitting to give references helps to uphold the Roman idea of a difference between Paul's testimony and that of the Twelve: "Paul est témoin non du Christ, ce qui est réservé aux apôtres, témoins oculaires, mais pour le Christ martyr, en opposition à ceux qui ne sont que des apôtres: Act.XVII,31." Against this it must be pointed out that Luke calls Stephen μαρτυρὸς σου (Ac.22.20).

(2) Cf. Is.51.4: ὅτι νόμος, παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ ἡ κείρις μου εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν. All this is against Strathmann (KWB.IV.509.13-27) who cannot see μαρτύριον as referring to missionary proclamation but only as having the aim of making the hearers guilty. The present thesis does not deny that this may be a result of the testifying just as may martyrdom but these are not the function or aim of the apostolic, prophetic witnessing. Von Campenhausen (Idee, p.24) and others take this as a reference to testimony to be borne at the Last Judgement but that is not Israel's raison d'être, although the rendering of such testimony may well take place at that event. It is clear that the testimony envisaged by Jesus is given in this world and to this world as Ps.118.46 shows. Peterson (Zeuge der Wahrheit, p.172) puts the R.C. view of the origin of the word 'martyr' and then, to preserve the exclusive position of the Twelve Apostles, concludes that the apostle is more important than the martyr; He continues (p.273): "Die apostolischen

It follows from the above that the commission of the Twelve has reference only to the proclamation of the teaching of God.⁽¹⁾ The authority granted to them is described as one of healing since all through Isaiah blindness and deafness symbolise trust in idols, acceptance of false teaching about the divine.⁽²⁾ Their first instruction is that they should preach saying: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" and they are assured that the Holy Spirit will supply the message. H. Delehay⁽³⁾ admits that "l'inspiration qui lui est promise, place le chrétien appelé à rendre compte de sa foi, dans l'état prophétique." But to retain the Roman view he must retract

Leiden können sich sehr wohl in einem Märtyrer erneuern der in einem juridischen Sinne kein Nachfolger der Apostel ist, wie ja auch die Wunder der Apostel von Menschen vollbracht werden können, die, juridisch gesehen, nicht Nachfolger der Apostel sind. Das Martyrium ist also ein Charisma und nicht notwendig an ein Amt in der Kirche gebunden."

(1) The cup of cold water (v.42) points to this; in Prov.25.25 it is equated with good news; cf. Dt. 32.2; Is.12.3; 35.6f; 55.1; Jer. 18.14f; Jn.4.7-14; 7.37; 1 Cor.3.6 and the interesting quotation from the Gospel of the Ebionites in Epiphanius: Adv. Haer. 30.13 where Jesus, having called the Twelve, says to them: "Ὑμᾶς οὖν βούλομαι εἶναι δεκαδύο ἀποστόλους, εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ." (J.-P. Migne: Patrologiae, XLI.428), and another in Clem. Alex.: Strom. 6.6. from The Preaching of Peter: Αὐτίκα ἐν τῷ Πέτρου κηρύγματι ὁ Κύριος φησὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, "Ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς δώδεκα μαθητὰς, κείνας ἀξίους ἐμοῦ." οὓς ὁ Κύριος ἐθέλησε καὶ ἀποστόλους οἱ δὲ μὴ πιστεύσαντες, ἀκούσαντες, μαρτυρήσωσιν οὐκ ἔχοντες ἀπολογίαν εἰπεῖν. Οὐκ ἤκούσαμεν.
(Migne. IX.269-272).

(2) Is.29.18; 42.7,16-19; 50.4f; 58.7f.

(3) Sanctus, p.100.

in the next sentence. "On ne voit pas, pourtant, que jamais martyrs ou confesseurs aient été, à n'importe quel moment, qualifiés de prophètes." This is contradicted by Rev. 19.10. Confirmation that the μαρτύριον is the gospel or kerygma of the early church corresponding to the torah of God in the OT is provided by Mk.13.9f: καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἑμοῦ, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. καὶ εἰς πάντα

τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον .⁽¹⁾
Here again the disciples are told that the content of the testimony will be given them by the Holy Spirit. There is in all this no trace of any special authority vested in the disciples which is valid simply because Jesus has commissioned them.⁽²⁾ Their authority is the truth which Jesus himself has spoken,⁽³⁾ his words which will not pass away (Mk.13.31, par.)⁽⁴⁾. In the same way the μαρτύριον of the leper (Mt.8.4, par.) is a declaration of the good news by means of his action in showing himself to the priest. That the man was cured would admit of no doubt but that Jesus was the promised Saviour was something

(1) Cf. Mt.24.14; Lk.21.12f; against von Campenhausen (*Idee*, pp.24ff.) who will not admit that this is in any way concerned with missionary activity.

(2) Schweizer (*Church Order in the New Testament*, 2 i) is not quite correct in saying: "of that group of disciples as a school for Church leaders there was certainly never any thought". The disciples were being taught in order to teach or testify and the parables of stewardship are clear indications of this; further, the teachers were the natural leaders.

(3) The gospel is directly "Jesus' words" (Mk.8.35,38) and the preaching, teaching, or testifying of the gospel is an eschatological event in which the authority of the word may make itself felt in the hearer and so be his salvation, cf. Friedrich (KWB.II.726.24-31).

(4) Cf. Ps.118.152: κατ' ἀρχὰς ἔγνων ἐκ τῶν μαρτυρίων σου, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἔθεμελίωσας αὐτά.

that was either 'seen' or not 'seen'.⁽¹⁾ Strathmann interprets all the above instances of μαρτύριον (except Lk.21.13) as referring to the testimony that makes guilty but this is only one aspect of it; it is a consequence, not a motive. The gospel and the μαρτύριον are one and the same thing and each, as Paul shows, can be a savour of death or a savour of life (II Cor.2.14,16). Strathmann's explanation of the difference between Luke's account and the other two does not do justice to the obvious similarities. It is not easy to see why he denies here what he allows in Ac.4.33 and in the Pauline epistles.⁽²⁾

(1) Against Strathmann's view that μαρτύριον is testimony for the prosecution at the Last Judgement. S. avers that, in the context, the testimony can in no way be understood as the active witness of missionary proclamation and has only the aim of making the opponents guilty. (KWB. IV.508.28 - 510.7). But, in the sort of circumstances envisaged here, viz. the presentation of the testimony to those who are in opposition to Jesus, Agrippa admits that Paul has almost persuaded him to become a Christian; whether Agrippa is sincere or sarcastic the fact remains that he recognises that Paul is preaching the Christian message. Str/Bill. (I.p.474f.) quotes Jub.1.7f; 4.19; 10.17; Apoc. Baruch. 84.7 and continues: "So soll der geheilte Aussätzige den Priestern in Jerusalem zum Zeugnis dienen, dass der erscheinen ist der die Aussätzigen rein macht."

(2) KWB. IV.510.9-20: Dodd (The Appearances of the Risen Christ, p.55) notes that the μαρτύριον refers three times to healing, preaching and suffering, "the three characteristics of the eschaton" and that therefore it is testimony to the governors that the end is near, which is not the same thing as preaching the Gospel to them. This view he takes from Kilpatrick (The Gentile Mission in Mark and Matthew, 13.9-11) but it is one which is scarcely broad enough in view of the obvious relationship between the testimony of the OT and that of the NT.

In the apocalyptic passage (Mt.24,par.) the gospel of the kingdom is explicitly stated to be a μαρτύριον which is to be proclaimed to the whole world (Mt.24.14,par.)⁽¹⁾ and is contrasted with false prophecy (vv.5,11,24). It is made clear that Jesus' words, the message, the testimony of Jesus is of a permanent nature (v.35); its source is the Spirit (the oil in the parable of the Virgins); it is the ὑπάρχοντα delivered to the servants by their lord and with which they 'trade'; in this stewardship it is faithfulness which confers authority (25.14-21). Thus, in Matthew explicitly and in Mark and Luke⁽²⁾ implicitly, the testimony which the witnesses are to present is a specific message,⁽³⁾ it is 'the gospel of the kingdom' which Jesus himself preached, which John the Baptist proclaimed before him and which the true prophets of the OT had preserved and delivered.⁽⁴⁾

(1) Mk.13.9; Lk.21.12. Delehay (Sanctus, p. 78), with others, takes these verses in a martyrological sense: "Nous sommes ici transportés dans le cadre des Actes des martyrs." Dornseiff (Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, 22 (1923-25), pp. 136f.) translates μαρτύριον (Lk.21.13) as 'Martyrium' and comments: "Zeugnis gabe hier keinen Sinn", in spite of the fact that μαρτύριον is closely linked by οὖν and γὰρ to the two following verses which have obviously to do with speaking the word of God.

(2) Von Campenhausen (Die Idee, p. 26) takes 21.13 as referring to a testimonial to a good character, an interpretation which would render the statement almost irrelevant.

(3) Riddle (ZNW, 4(1934), pp. 272-274) quotes these passages in bold type to lend weight to his thesis that they are Verfolgungslogien; cf. the same writer, Journal of Religion, IV. (1924), pp. 174-191.

(4) Asting (Die Verkündigung, pp. 594f.) makes a distinction between gospel and testimony: "ἐὺαγγέλιον bezeichnet die Offenbarung so, wie sie in der Verkündigung als eine Heilsbotschaft hervortritt, während μαρτύριον betont, dass die Offenbarung eine Bekanntgabe von Gottes Willen bedeutet, durch welche sein Rechtstreit mit dem Satan entschieden wird." But see Cerfaux: Recueil, II, p. 168: "La petite phrase: 'ceci finira pour vous dans le témoignage' ne signifie quelque chose que si Luc a voulu donner toute sa valeur au moment solennel du témoignage chrétien."

A preaching or teaching commission similar to the above is found in Lk.24.44-48; cf. Mt.28.18ff. where the eleven and those who were gathered with them are shown by the risen Christ how all the things which he had already told them, viz. that which is written about him in the law of Moses, and in the prophets and in the psalms must be fulfilled, that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in his name everywhere and that (in the future (!)) they are to be witnesses (μαρτυρες) ⁽¹⁾ of these things. This testifying should be looked at in the light of the Mishna tractate Eduyoth where testimony is "the propagation of Torah by teachers who had received it in true succession". ⁽²⁾

That the disciples were eye-witnesses of the events of Jesus' life and ear-witnesses of his teaching need hardly be stated. Luke refers to this in his prologue, calling them αὐτόπται but if τούτων in 24.48 refers to οἱ λόγοι μου and πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα in v.44 and μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν in v.47, as seems reasonable, then it follows

(1) "The context indicates the future." (Casey, The Beginnings of Christianity, p.32).

(2) See above pp.101f. Cf. Carrington (The Primitive Christian Catechism, p.70): "there is evidence that one element of great importance in the Christian ekklesia was the propagation of torah by teachers who had received it in true succession, and that the process was oral. Cf. Gerhardsson (Memory and Manuscript, p.183): "The value of such sayings (in Eduyot) for the Rabbis is entirely dependent on their historicity," that is to say, on whether a Rabbi had actually said them or not but not on whether the quoter had actually heard or seen. Günther (Μάριος, p.103) takes too narrow a view of the content of the disciples' testimony - "zunächst und vor allem der Auferweckung; (cf. Kattenbusch (ZNW.4(1903), p.112)...es sich hier nicht um einen 'Augenzeugen', sondern um einen 'Redezeugen' handelt." In Dt.31, Moses makes his last speech to Israel and commands them to pass on the teaching he has given them which is summed up in the Song (Dt.32); this Song which is to be taught is called a μαρτύριον .

that the testimony referred to here is not simply one of events but of truths which are interpretations of the events. G. Friedrich's words concerning the gospel preached by Paul are equally apposite here: "Das Evangelium will nicht um von einem historischem Ereignis Zeugnis geben; denn was es berichtet, Auferstehung und Erhöhung, entzieht sich dem historischen Urteil und ist Aufhebung der Geschichte; es besteht auch nicht nur aus einigen Erzählungen über Jesus und Worten von ihm, die jeder Christ kennen muss und über die man sprechen kann, noch viel weniger ist es eine weltfremde dogmatische Formel, sondern es ist bezogen auf die menschliche Wirklichkeit und erweist sich als lebendige Macht."⁽¹⁾ It is significant that Luke does not confine the title to the eleven but applies it to others associated with them (24.33) and consequently the authority attaching to them is not so much an authorisation transmitted by Jesus on one particular occasion, rather is it the authority of the truth of his words which they have heard from his own lips, the testimony of the scriptures concerning himself who is the fulfilment of the testimony.⁽²⁾ There can be no doubt that,

(1) KWB, II. 728f; cf. Asting, Die Verkündigung, pp. 596f.

(2) Strathmann (Das NT Deutsch, I (1960), pp. 7f.) claims that the apostles' commission confers more authority than the fact that they testify; cf. Rengstorff: Die Auferstehung Jesu pp. 137-140 and Sass who, in connection with the 'above five hundred brethren' of I Cor. 15.6, writes (Apostelamt und Kirche, p. 137): "Wenn diese Augenzeugen nun den Auferstandenen verkündigten, so wurden sie sicher noch nicht Apostel genannt, sondern ganz schlicht 'Zeugen'. Ein Apostel bedurfte ja einer Sendung und Bevollmächtigung und da der Begriff 'Apostel' bis dahin nur juristischer Ausdruck für die Bevollmächtigung seitens eines Menschen war, ist es unwahrscheinlich, dass sich all diese 'Zeugen Christi' nun so gleich 'Apostel Christi' genannt hatten. Sass on p. 140, denies that Paul has the same qualifications as the Jerusalem or Galilean Christian messengers or that he can be any more than a witness of the risen Christ (quoting I Cor. 9.1). It must be emphasised that commission and testimony cannot be separated in actual fact; the witness who 'sees' the truth is aware of the compulsion to preach it. He does not wait

as noted by R. Asting,⁽¹⁾ there is an echo in Lk.24.48: ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων and Ac.1.8: καὶ ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες, of Is.43.10,12: γένεσθέ μοι μάρτυρες ὑμεῖς ἐμοὶ μάρτυρες and 44.8: μάρτυρες ὑμεῖς ἐστε.

for a later commission, unless this be one which the Church confers (Ac.13.1-3). The sending of the Twelve and the Seventy by Jesus is to be taken as a sign of the sending of all the messengers of the risen Christ. The so-called "severe struggle" for the recognition of his authority which Paul is alleged by the Tübingen school to have had with the Jerusalem church was certainly not provoked by the so-called 'closed circle of eye-witnesses'. Peter and John and James saw the validity of Paul's position right away (Ac.15.7-11; 13-19). It is important to notice the order of events in the Jerusalem Council:

- (a) Paul and Barnabas state their case (15.4).
- (b) Certain of the Pharisees rise up in opposition (15.5).
- (c) Much ζήτησις (= searching the Scriptures, not necessarily bitter controversy) takes place (15.7). See below.
- (d) Peter defends Paul's position (15.7-11).
- (e) Paul and Barnabas speak again in the same terms as before (15.12).
- (f) James as the moderator gives his decision, with which Paul and Barnabas presumably concur (15.13-21).
- (g) This becomes the finding of the whole assembly (15.22).

Gerhardsson (Memory and Manuscript, pp.250f.) says that Ac.15.1ff. records a dispute. He translates στάσις καὶ ζήτησις as 'discord and debate' when, according to a LXX precedent it might just as well mean 'standing and enquiring' or 'standing and instruction.' II Esd. 18.1-7 may well give the correct background in this case: "And Esdras the scribe stood on a wooden stage and there stood next to him Mattathias.....all the people stood.....and Jesus and Banaias and Sarabias instructed (ἤσαν governing) the people in the law." The surprising thing is that, on p. 250, note 4, G. recognises that ζήτησις may mean 'legal' or doctrinal examination'.

It is a fact that there was a real controversy between Paul and Barnabas (15.36-41) in which neither would yield to the authority of the other.

(1) Die Verkündigung, p.562; cf. Seeligman (The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, p. 28) who points out that in Is.43.10 twice the thought is emphatically advanced, without any sanction in the Hebrew text and with a deliberate change in its content, that God bears witness on behalf of his devotees.

The μαθηταίον has many synonyms and the presentation of it by the disciples is described in many ways. At this point it may be observed that in the light of the witness-concept the distinction between the general term 'disciple' on the one hand and 'the Twelve' and 'the Apostles' on the other is narrowed down to the fact that the Twelve and the other apostles are reported as having been sent by Jesus on a special mission. All are expected to be lightbearers, i.e. teachers (Mt.5.14), to prophesy in Jesus' name (Mt.7.22), to confess Christ before men (Mt.10.32), ⁽¹⁾ to labour in the harvest (Mt.9.37f.), to labour in the vineyard (Mt.20.1f.) and to give the household their portion of meat in due season (Lk.12.42). ⁽²⁾ The Twelve are distinguished from the apostles by the fact that they are ordained to be with him (Mk.3.14); the apostles, on the other hand, are those disciples whom Jesus sends on mission after an association with himself which might be more or less close.

Other expressions in the Synoptics for the testifying of the early church are 'teaching' (Mk.6.30), 'preaching' (κηρύσσειν) the nearness of the kingdom' (Mt.10.7; Lk. 9.2), 'preaching repentance' (Mk.6.12) and forgiveness' (Lk. 24.47f.), ⁽³⁾ 'preaching the gospel' (Mk.16.15) or simply

(1) Cf. Michel (KWB.V. 207.24ff.): "Der forensische Sinn des ὁμολογεῖν ist vielleicht in der nt. lichen Überlieferung der wichtigste."

(2) It is extremely difficult here as elsewhere to be certain whether the evangelists use μαθηταί as meaning the Twelve only or whether they include 'those with them' (Lk.24.33).

(3) Cf. Friedrich: KWB. III.707, note 51.

'preaching' (Mk.3.14), 'trading with talents' (Mt.25.14ff.)⁽¹⁾ and 'teaching Jesus' commandments' (Mt.28.20); all this is summed up in the term: τὸ ἔργον.⁽²⁾ Jesus, as Riesenfeld surmises,⁽³⁾ transmitted to his disciples a logos whose outlines were already defined and this was the starting point of a tradition.

The Content of the Testimony

The content of the testimony borne by the disciples is "the gospel" (Mt.24.14, Mk.13.9f)⁽⁴⁾ which comprises (a) the sovereignty of God as implied in the phrase 'the kingdom of heaven' (Mt.10.7; cf. 13.19; Lk.9.2,60; (b) the moral demand of God as signified by the preaching of repentance (Mk.6.12; cf. Lk.24.47); (c) God's redemptive activity in Jesus (Lk.24.46) which must be preached to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Mt.10.6; Lk.24.47);⁽⁵⁾ (d) the promise of the Father in Lk.24.49 and the idea of judgement are present (Mt.7.2; 23.33 etc.) and the resurrection of Jesus is seen as the guarantee of the fulfilment of God's promise (Lk.24.46) and as being in itself the guarantee of the presence of Jesus with his church to the end of the world (Mt.28.20; Mk.16.20).⁽⁶⁾ All this has its roots

(1) The property is delivered (παρέδωκεν - the word usually employed for the handing down of tradition).

(2) Cf. Michel (KWB. V. 212.22ff.): "Die urchristliche Verkündigung (κῆρυγμα) und Lehre (διδασχὴ) als ein Bekennen (ὁμολογεῖν) und Bezeugen (μαρτυρεῖν) bezeichnet und geschildert wird." cf. Diem, Ev. Theol. 1 (1934-35), p. 422.2.

(3) The Gospel Tradition, pp. 27-30.

(4) Rengstorf (KWB. II. 147.39ff. on Mt. 28.20): "Der Inhalt des διδάσκειν ist πάντα ὅσα ἐντελέαμην ὑμῖν also nicht die Heilsverkündigung von Jesus, sondern die Verkündigung Jesu, seine διδασχὴ."

(5) Rengstorf, Apostleship, pp. 11-24.

(6) Casey (The Beginnings of Christianity, p. 32) confines the subject of testimony in Ac. 13.9 to the end of the world and the coming of the kingdom and in Lk. 24 to the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus but if the μαρτύριον is the gospel it must include the whole range of Jesus' preaching and teaching in word and deed.

in the OT rather than in the preaching of the primitive church which faithfully "referred back to something that had already happened, to Jesus of Nazareth, his teaching, his works" and he in turn to "the Torah tradition".⁽¹⁾

The Authority of the Witnesses

The authority of the disciples⁽²⁾ is clearly set forth in these three Gospels as being of a similar nature to that of Jesus and the prophets who went before him; they are to bear the testimony of God⁽³⁾ and are his authoritative messengers; in the words of J. Schniewind:⁽⁴⁾ "Ursprünglich aber bedeutet Zeugnis und Zeuge, dass Jemand mit Vollmacht von Gott redet, ihn bezeugt." In the prologue to Lk. the first Christian preachers and teachers are described as οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀγγέλλουσι καὶ διδάσκουσι⁽⁵⁾ γινόμενοι τοῦ λόγου⁽⁶⁾.

(1) Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, p. 324.

(2) Harnack (The Constitution and Law of the Church, pp. 16-19) has shown that there was no authoritative element in the early conception of the Church and that there was equality among members, the whole Church making important decisions (Ac.15).

(3) Von Campenhausen (KA. und GV, pp. 17f.) stresses the position of the Twelve as "die grundlegenden Zeugen der Auferstehung Christi" and states: "Als die Zeugen Christi sind die Zwölf zum 'Fundament' der Kirche geworden"; cf. pp. 23-25 where v. C. claims that the authority of the apostles rests on the two factors of eye-witness of the resurrected Christ and commission by him. But this must be taken back to the word and testimony which Jesus gave them to deliver to the world and v. C. at least recognises (p.25) that it is this which is the legacy of the apostolic authority.

(4) Markus, p. 135; cf. Kierkegaard (The Difference between a Genius and an Apostle, p.147): "God cannot help men by providing them with physical certainty that an Apostle is an Apostle - which would, moreover, be nonsense.....just as it is nonsense to require a physical certainty that God exists, since God is spirit."

(5) Cf. Ep. Diog., 11.1: ἀποστόλων γινόμενος μαθητὴς γίνουμι διδάσκαλος ἑθνῶν. τὰ παραδοθέντα ἀξίως ὑπηρετῶ γινόμενοις ἀληθείας μαθηταῖς. That Luke uses ὑπηρετῆς and διακονεῖν interchangeably is seen from Ac.13.5 and 19.22. Note the variant εἰς διακονίαν in Cod. E.

(6) "This suggests....one group of persons filling two functions."

This has been taken as a proof of the superior authority of the Jerusalem apostles but such a supposition can hardly be correct since the eye-witnesses of Jesus have no real authority over Paul, for example, who was not a disciple of Jesus⁽¹⁾ but whom Luke describes as ⁽²⁾ ὁπηρετής and μαρτυρὸς (Ac. 26.16), a parallel phrase. The object of the αὐτοψία⁽³⁾ (if this means eye-witness testimony) of the disciples is the person of Jesus, his actions, his words, his death and his resurrection (if this last can be called a 'visible event'), but the μαρτύριον⁽⁴⁾ is the presentation of the events⁽⁴⁾ along with their interpretation

(Cadbury, Beginnings of Christianity, Part I. Vol. I. p. 498). Trench (Synonyms, p. 32) notes that ὁπηρετής is used by Euripides: Hecuba. 503 for the herald who carries solemn messages.

(1) Michaelis (KWB. V. 349. lf.) points out that there is a dependence of faith on seeing which is unfaith (Mk. 15.32; Jn. 20. 25, 27) and (ib. p. 349.3f.) that Jn. 20.29 and I Pet. 1.8 show that faith without eye-witnessing is fully of equal value to faith grounded on it. It cannot, however, be said too strongly that the eye-witness testimony is only the ground of the faith in the same sense as the soil is the ground of the plant's existence; the soil does not create the life of the seed but it provides the essential factors and environment. Cf. Käsemann (ZThK 48. (1951), pp. 304-311): "Der Christus praesens legitimiert die Tradition nicht umgekehrt." Cf. also Schweizer, Church Order, 24a.

(2) That τοῦ λόγου belongs to ὁπηρετάι only, (as Plummer: St. Luke. ICC. p. 3) is disproved by the fact that γένόμενα separates them.

(3) In the Hermetic Literature there is an instance of the use of αὐτόπτης of one who sees God but not in this life - only with the eyes of the soul. (W. Scott, Hermetica. I. 418.13).

(4) Cf. Althaus (The So-called Kerygma, pp. 27-30): "The Kerygma of the apostles and the Church has always a historical content." A. denies that this is true for the prophets (p. 30) but this view is untenable in view of the evidence adduced in the chapters on the OT in the present thesis.

which is spiritually discerned⁽¹⁾ as a result of the testimony of the Spirit. The function of the first eye-witness is to place before his audience the clearest and truest word-picture of the event which is Jesus⁽²⁾ (accompanied, of course, by appropriate behaviour),⁽³⁾ accompanied by his interpretation of the event⁽⁴⁾ but ultimately the hearer must make his own decision about the authenticity of the αὐτοψία and the interpretation of it, as to whether it is true that Jesus is Lord, that his word is to be obeyed, that his death is a salvation-event and that his resurrection is the real first-fruits of a resurrection to life eternal on the part of all

(1) Cf. Van Peet, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, II. 832a, para. 1. ; Robinson, The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit, p. 155. Hoskyns (The Fourth Gospel, p. 103) notes correctly that it is their faith and the knowledge they had as a result of their faith which gave the original disciples any apostolic authority at all. Cerfaux (Témoins du Christ, p. 165) writes: "L'Esprit-Saint travaille par sa puissance actuelle, comme par la révélation contenue dans les prophéties, à imposer la foi à la résurrection." Menoud (Eglise et Théologie 68. Juin (1960) pp. 10f.) shows that "le témoin au sens fort (μάερος) est plus qu'un simple témoin oculaire; he correctly insists that Luke distinguishes between αὐτόπτης and μάερος and that it is as the latter that they are chosen by the risen Christ.

(2) Cf. Dodd (History and the Gospel, p. 162): "The kerygma itself is no more than the rehearsal of the history in which the kingdom of God came." Note the care taken by the Gospel writers to cite names of witnesses and to show that the required number is always present at happenings which might arouse scepticism.

(3) There is no question of the witnesses' behaviour guaranteeing the truth of the testimony as Labriolle (Bulletin d'ancienne Littérature et d'Archéologie Chrétiennes (1911), pp. 50f.):

"l'homme qui, pour certifier la vérité d'un fait, d'une doctrine ou sa foi en un être supérieur, va jusqu'à accepter les tourments et la mort, celui-là est par excellence le 'témoin' de cet être, de cette doctrine, de ce fait."

(4) Morgenthaler (Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, II. p. 25) shows that Luke's testimony is true history while not being concerned simply with the chronicling of facts - "denn Zeugnis habe es mit Theologie nicht aber mit banaler 'Historizität' zu tun."

believers.⁽¹⁾ If the hearer makes the Christian decision he must then proceed to become thoroughly acquainted with the testimony so that he in turn may become a witness and pass on the original αὐτοψία (which can never be dispensed with) and with it the apostolic interpretation of it which he has accepted. Paradoxically, the more accurately the first witness presents his αὐτοψία the more he reduces any authority he may have⁽²⁾ over his hearer: once he has imparted his complete knowledge of Jesus to his disciple he has raised that disciple to his own level of authority (Lk. 6.40): indeed it is this equality at which he is always aiming for he longs to present his people "perfect before the throne" (Col. 1.28).⁽³⁾ The only exception to this is Jesus himself for he is the word in its fulness, he is the μαρτυρεῖον who, as John reports, bears witness of himself (8.14-18). In point of fact there is a sense in which the primary witnesses are really only secondary witnesses for what they pass on is really Jesus'

(1) Cf. Michaelis, KWB. V. 347.45-349.2. Torrance (Conflict and Agreement in the Church, pp. 71f.) does not give a broad enough definition of μαρτυρεῖον and distinguishes it from κήρυγμα, which latter he takes in a verbal sense but both words refer primarily to the content of what is taught or preached. T. makes the important point that in the testifying "the original μαρτυρεῖον actually takes place in the experience of the hearer".

(2) Any authority he may have is a teaching authority, that is to say, he may know more about Jesus than his hearers do but his extra knowledge, as such, does not give him an official authority. Barth asks (Church Dogmatics, Vol. I. Part I. p. 126): "Why and in what respect does the Biblical witness possess authority?" and answers: "In that it claims no authority whatsoever for itself, that its witness amounts to letting the Something else be the authority, itself and by its own agency."

(3) Cf. Schweitzer, Church Order, 7h.

testimony to himself but the διήγησις (Lk. 1.1) of the αὐτόπται is essential for it enables the second and later generations to see and hear Jesus and consequently to 'see' and 'hear' him without whom there is no revelation. It is thus clear that the eye-witness testimony of the person, teaching and works of Jesus is of great importance; without it there can be no μαρτυρεῖον⁽¹⁾ but authority is something in which the witness is not really interested; he is concerned only to preach the gospel,⁽²⁾ "a historical event charged with transcendent significance."⁽³⁾ What Hoskyns says of the Fourth Gospel is true of all the NT testimony: "The Fourth Gospel was written in order that the Christians of a later generation might be confronted by this earlier witness and in order that, created by it, they also might be invested with apostolic authority."⁽⁴⁾ Bultmann is correct in stating that "The salvation occurrence.....does not become a fact of the past but constantly takes place in the present,"⁽⁵⁾ but this does not mean that the facts of the past can be denied, that the death of Jesus was not a salvation event for the repentant thief; without the event there would be no testimony or else only false testimony. It must be remembered that the apostles had more than the kerygma; they had the 'memory', stimulated

(1) Cf. Menoud, Eglise et Théologie 68. Juin (1960). p. 7. and Cullmann, The Early Church, pp. 83-91. The μαρτυρεῖα of the first apostles is the superior written norm which is the sufficient criterion of Revelation and controls the teaching office of the Church.

(2) Cf. Diem, Ev. Theol. 1. (1934-35). pp. 424-426.

(3) G. Miegge, Gospel and Myth, p. 107

(4) p. 100.

(5) Theology. I. p. 302.

by the Holy Spirit, of Jesus, his words, deeds and personality. It is true, as Bultmann says in his Theology of the New Testament (p. 302), that "the salvation-occurrence is no-where present except in the proclaiming, accosting, demanding, and promising word of preaching. A merely "reminiscent" historical account referring to what happened in the past cannot make the salvation event visible," but this surely is just another way of saying that the preacher must be convinced that the historical event of which he speaks is salvation event for him and may be the same for his hearers and must say so; it is an historical event, or a memory of it, or a re-presentation of it which is "seen" to be, and is accepted as, salvation event and there can be no "seeing" and no accepting unless this historical event is available. The 'word' is not simply 'heralding' by authorised messengers⁽¹⁾ it is also testimony which requires a personal experience of the event of Jesus. Zahn says: "Seeing and testifying are inseparable (Rev. i.2; John i.34; 1 John i.2, iv.14). The disciples of Jesus could not be his witnesses unless with their own eyes they had seen him who lived on earth and died and rose again, and unless they had perceived through all their senses his entire manifestation of himself."⁽²⁾ But this living, dying and risen man, as he presents himself to the senses, is not the complete content of the testimony; the true content, which of course cannot be borne except by the living, dying and risen man Jesus, is that he is the salvation of God. Simply to have known Jesus "after the flesh" is in itself, as Paul saw, really valueless. The testimony of the eye-witness

(1) ib. I. p. 307.

(2) Introduction to the New Testament II. p. 155, note 9.

solely as eye-witness is the same as the testimony of the world to Jesus, viz. that he is a teacher come from God (Nicodemus), a prophet (the people), a blasphemer (the scribes and Pharisees) and so on. One must maintain with E. Burnier⁽¹⁾ "une distinction essentielle....il s'agit d'une distinction et non d'une opposition."

At the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount Jesus extols the law and the prophets; and having likened the coming persecution of his disciples to that suffered by the prophets before them,⁽²⁾ states that whoever shall do and teach the commandments of the law and the prophets shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven (Mt. 5.10-19; cf. Lk. 6.22-26). After the commissioning of the Twelve apostles⁽³⁾ he makes some remarks about discipleship (Mt. 10.32ff.) which may apply only to the Twelve or to disciples in general - πάντες οὖν ὁστίς (10.32). In any case, those to whom he is speaking - all of them being disciples, presumably - are told: "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that

(1) La Notion de Témoinage, p. 25.

(2) Cf. Fascher: ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, pp. 182f.

(3) The fact that in Cod A the LXX at III K. 14.6 translates Πᾶσι as εἰμί ἀπόστολος shows that it is not unreasonable to think of anyone who has a message from God as an apostle. In this incident Ahijah the prophet is not sent to any place or person with his divine message! He remains in his own place and delivers the message to the queen when she arrives to consult him! There is certainly no indication that Ahijah had any official position; he was simply a man of God who received Revelation and passed it on. Moving about from place to place is not an essential characteristic of an apostle in this sense. It is to be noted that the Revelation is not unconnected with the age-old testimony concerning the sovereignty of God, his moral law, his past mercies and his promises for the future, as III K. 11.33-38 shows. Jesus' apostles are the men who deliver his message and, like Ahijah, they have no official authority.

sent me.⁽¹⁾ He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward." (Mt.10.40f.). This suggests that these disciples are prophetic apostles, men who have been sent on a prophetic mission.⁽²⁾ The Twelve are called apostles in Mt.10.2; Mk.6.30 and Lk.6.13; 9.10; 22.14 and the disciples are given the title in Lk. 17.5. In Lk. 24.9f. it is not unreasonable to suppose that the author applies the title to "the eleven and all the rest" (cf.v.33).⁽³⁾

(1) Lindsay (The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries, p.31) points out that whoever received a little child in Jesus' name received him (Mt.18.5).

(2) Cf. Rendtorf (KWB. VI. 810.37f.): "Der (OT) Prophet versteht sich also selbst als Boten Jahwes, dessen Wort er weiterzusagen hat."

(3) Cerfaux (Témoins du Christ), following Catholic tradition, fails to take into account the other persons present at this commissioning of witnesses. All through this article he insists on the exclusive character of the Twelve and on the resurrection as being the principal content of their testimony; he even denies Paul a place exactly on their level: "Puisque St. Paul est apôtre, presque (cette petite réserve parce qu'il n'a pas vécu avec le Christ durant sa vie temporelle) au même titre que les Douze." (p.159) C. returns (p. 160) to this "différence essentielle entre Paul et les Douze": "Ceux-ci sont avant tout les 'témoins' de la résurrection; Paul est par vocation le porteur du message chrétien aux Gentiles;" cf. p. 166: "Pierre le témoin par excellence.....Paul le héraut du message chrétien." and the same page, note 3, where C. conveniently omits to mention that in I Clem. 5.4,7 μαρτυρεῖσας is used of both Peter and Paul. Rétif (Témoignage et Prédication, p. 155, note (13)) gives quotations from Iren. Adv. Haer., III, XII, 3 and others in which Peter is called a herald. C. supports his position by contrasting Ac. 26.16 and Lk. 1.2 (which he gratuitously presumes to refer to the Twelve) in which 'servant of the word' and 'witness' are in different order; but the reverse process could be applied in Ac. 6.3f. to the Twelve and the Seven and in Ac. 1.25 διακονία comes before ἀποστολή with reference to the position of the Twelve. It is dangerous to argue from the order of words! Over against C's position must be set von Campenhausen's point in Stud. Theol. (1947-8), p.109, that the suspect apostles of Did. 11.3-6 could never have arisen if the word 'apostle' had been from the beginning a title only for the Twelve.

The shaliach or apostle is invested with the authority of the one who sends him⁽¹⁾ and this comes out clearly in the commissioning of the Twelve when Jesus gives them ἐξουσία over unclean spirits and to preach about the kingdom (Mt.10.1,5-8). It is significant that in the milieu in which the Church was born uncleanness was associated with ignorance of the ordinances of God and the Spirit of true counsel (Qs.3.5f.; 4.20-22, 5.13f.)

However, they are to rejoice not that the spirits are subject to them but because their names are written in heaven, i.e. because they are true prophets.⁽²⁾ Their authority is to be a spiritual authority which derives from the words they speak which are a spiritual gift from the Lord,⁽³⁾ all authority is given to Jesus, not to the disciples! It is not they who speak but the Spirit of their Father who speaks in them (Mt.10.19f; Mk.13.11) for Jesus will give them a mouth⁽⁴⁾ and wisdom (Lk.21.15, cf. Jn.15.26)⁽⁵⁾ Another way of putting this is found in the parables of the talents and the pounds. The

(1) Ber. 5.5.

(2) Cf. Ezek.13.9.

(3) Cf. Grundmann, KWB. II.311-313. Kierkegaard cannot be altogether correct in stating (The Present Age, pp.147-150) that the authority does not rest in the content of the message. The Apostle never simply says, "Go!" All he says is in terms of the total Gospel tradition.

(4) "For the Rabbis the study of the Tora was the 'work of the mouth'." (Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, p. 81).

(5) Barth (Der Augenzeuge) says on p. 2 what he stresses throughout that the apostles (i.e. the Twelve) depend for their authority on the fact that they were eye-witnesses of the incarnate Son and yet he can speak near the end of his book of "blosses(!) Hören, Sehen und Betasten" when it is without faith. They were certainly eye-witnesses and the object of their witnessing was the sensible basis of their experience but their later testimony depended on their interpretation, through the help of the Holy Spirit, of the signs they saw, heard and touched. The Gospel they preached was their interpretation of the facts, which was in fact Jesus' interpretation. They testified as the prophets before them had testified and they claimed no special rights or position on account of their eye-witnessing.

servants who trade faithfully, i.e. those who present the authentic testimony are set over (καθίστημι) the Lord's household (many things) (Mt. 24.45, par; 25.21,23; cf. Ac. 6.3) or are given ἐξουσία⁽¹⁾ over a number of cities (Lk. 19.17). There is a short form of these parables in Mk. 13.34 where the servants are said to have been given, not talents or pounds but ἐξουσία and to every man his μέρος.

In his post-resurrection instructions to the disciples according to Mt. and Mk. it is the eleven whom Jesus authorises to teach and preach; according to Lk. it is the eleven and those that were with them to whom he gives the title witnesses. This establishes the fact that the men who were not only called as disciples but were also chosen 'to be with Jesus' and were sent on mission work have no official authority over other disciples and apostles.⁽²⁾ Their superiority lies only in a special knowledge which they have received from the Lord. In any case the thought of this chapter develops from the idea of a mission to Israel to that of a wider mission with a more general class of missionary. The διακονία to which the disciples are called cannot be described as an office.⁽³⁾ If they have any authority at all it is the authority of the prophetic and teaching ministry. As to degrees of such authority Jesus makes several points. In the first place the authority of the disciple is not above that of his teacher "but everyone when he has been perfected (κατηγετισμένος)⁽⁴⁾ shall be as his teacher." (Lk. 6.40). He tells them that they

(1) ἐξουσία and οἰκονομία are both used in LXX to translate πρῶτον e.g. IV K. 20.13 and Is. 22.19.

(2) Cf. Schlatter, The Church in the NT Period, pp. 10-12; Schweizer (Church Order, 4g): "undoubtedly there nowhere appears in the conduct of affairs according to (Mt.) 18.15-18 any office-bearer, and all graduated titles are forbidden to the Church (23. 8-10)."

(3) Cf. Diem: Ev. Theol. 1(1934-35), pp. 423f.

(4) Cf. Eph. 4.11-15 which shows that to be perfected means 'to have received full instruction.' Also, in I Thess. 3.10; I Cor.

should not covet the name 'Rabbi' as a title of honour for the only person who may do so is himself; they are to regard themselves as equal, as brothers (Mt.23.8-12).⁽¹⁾ In this chapter Jesus is contrasting the disciples who are his witnesses⁽²⁾ with the scribes and the Pharisees of whom he says: μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι υἱοὶ ἐστέ τῶν φονευσάντων τοὺς προφῆτας (Mt.23.31; Lk.11.48 has: μάρτυρές ἐστε).⁽³⁾ The scribes and the Pharisees are the official⁽⁴⁾ leaders and teachers who sit in Moses' seat and whose teaching (presumably when it truly conforms to that of Moses and does not degenerate into 'the traditions of men') is to be observed, although their behaviour is not to be imitated. Jesus was well aware of the danger which arises when emphasis is placed upon the office as such rather than on the truth as revealed to conscience and insists that the greatest among them shall be their servant, the one who exalts himself shall be abased and the one who humbles himself shall be exalted (Mt. 23.11f.)⁽⁵⁾

1.10; cf. 1 Chron. 25.8 κατατίθειν is contrasted with

μανθάνειν.
(1) Reid (The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry, p.6) shows that Jesus here distinguishes his disciples from those of the rabbis.

(2) Cf. Filson, JBL, LX. (1941), pp.318-322.

(3) An echo of Is. 44.9 (Cod. Marchalianus): οἱ πλάσσοντες καὶ πάντες μάταιοι ποιοῦντες τὰ καταθύμια αὐτῶν ἃ οὐκ ὠφελήσκει αὐτούς· ἀλλὰ καὶ μαρτυρεῖς αὐτῶν εἰσὶν οὐκ ὄψονται καὶ οὐ γνώσονται ἵνα ἀσχυρῶσι.....(Θ).

(4) Cf. Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, I. pp. 93f.

(5) Cf. Mt. 11.25 which has close affinities with Ps.18.8: ὁ νόμος τοῦ κυρίου ἄρμος ἐπιστεφῶν ψυχάς· ἡ μαρτυρία κυρίου πιστὴ σοφίζουσα νήπια and Ps.118,129f.

That the leaders of the early church had simply a teaching authority⁽¹⁾ which depended on taking over the teaching of Jesus is borne out by the passage: ὁ πιστὸς δούλος καὶ φρόνιμος⁽²⁾ ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφήν⁽³⁾ ἐν καιρῷ (Mt. 24.45-51, cf. Lk. 12.42-46). It is obvious that here there is some reference to the teaching authority of the servant of God, the witness who preaches the gospel for a μαρτύριον (Mt. 24.14), especially in view of the preceding statement of Jesus concerning the gospel of the kingdom which is to be preached in all the world εἰς μαρτύριον to all nations and also Luke's addition in v. 48: "To whom they commit much, of him will they ask the more" where he uses the verb παρατίθεσθαι which means: 'to commit to someone a thing to be religiously kept and transmitted to others.'⁽⁴⁾ It is true that after the incident of the rich young man Jesus speaks of "those who have followed him" sitting on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel in the regeneration when the Son of Man will set on the throne of his glory (Mt. 19. 28) but his following words (vv. 29f.) suggest that this does

(1) Cf. Sohm, Kirchenrecht, pp. 22-28 and Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, pp. 12f.

(2) Φρόνιμος is used in the Parable of the Virgins to describe those who bore not only the lamp (of the Gospel) but also the oil (of the Spirit); it is used also of the man who built on the rock and Jesus tells the disciples that they are to be: φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις when he sends them out to preach and teach (Mt. 10.16).

(3) Cf. Heb. 5.12: ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι γεγόνатаι χρεῖαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος, οὐ στερεῆς τροφῆς.

(4) Grimm-Thayer, p. 486b. Cf. I Tim. 1.18; II Tim. 2.2.

not apply to the Twelve alone but to everyone who follows Jesus; the parable of the labourers which concludes the section underlines the truth that even longer service does not bring higher reward. Luke has a similar speech concerning the thrones, which Jesus makes at the last supper when the Twelve have been quarreling about which of them should be accounted the greatest (Lk.22.24-30). He compares the leaders of his organisation with the Gentiles who exercise authority (ἐξουσιάζοντες) and says that among the former the chief (ὁ ἡγούμενος) ⁽¹⁾ should be as the one who serves (ὁ διακονῶν). He promises them that they will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel but apart from the difficulty about the presence of Judas it must be noted that in the Apocalypse other people are represented as sitting on thrones in the future, viz. the four and twenty elders (Rev. 4.4; 11.16) and the souls of those who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus (διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ) (Rev. 20.4). There is nothing in the passages in Mt. and Lk. to imply that the occupation of thrones in the kingdom is to be confined to the Twelve. The mention of persecution in Mark's account (10.30) is a further indication that the twelve thrones are the reward of martyrdom. Further confirmation of this is supplied by Jesus' answer to the sons of Zebedee when they ask to sit at Jesus' side in glory (Mk.10.35-45; cf. Mt. 20.20-28), when he disclaims the right to confer such authority which belongs to God alone and tells them that to be great they must serve as he himself serves, the greatest service being self-sacrifice. ⁽²⁾

(1) Cf. Heb.13.7,17,24.

(2) The Episcopalian conception of 'The Essential Ministry' (cf. Kirk, The Apostolic Ministry, pp. 8ff.) is damaged by this plain statement by Jesus himself: Kirk states. "By the laying on of the hands of the Essential Ministry the aspirant to ministerial office received not only the commission to exercise

All three evangelists report that at another time when the disciples were arguing about authority Jesus said that the childlike are greatest in the kingdom of God for the least shall be the greatest (Mt.18.1-5; Mk.9.35-37; Lk.9.46-48),⁽¹⁾ but it would appear to follow from the incident of the exorcist who was outside the circle of disciples (Mk.9.38-40; Lk.9.49f.) that to have been one of their number was not the sole criterion of the kind of authority conferred by Jesus on the Twelve in Mt.10.1.; the fact that the man was able to perform a miracle in Jesus' name was sufficient to satisfy the Lord.⁽²⁾ In the Mt. account of Peter's confession of faith Jesus describes the confession as a revelation by God and the rock⁽³⁾ on which he will build his church (Mt.16.18). In the light of this it would appear that Jesus' promise to give to Peter the keys of the kingdom and the power to bind and loose is connected with the revelation and is a teaching authority.⁽⁴⁾ This is

certain functions; he was ushered into a special and distinctive sphere of grace, possessed of spiritual gifts and of the power as well as the right to dispense them to others; and in no other way could he enter that sphere." But the grace imparted by the apostles was clearly their testimony which confers no superior authority to one group of Christians over another other than that of the instructed teacher over the learner.

(1) Brosch (Charismen und Ämter in der Urkirche, p.166) says that Mt.18.1-4; 23.8-12; Lk.22.26 do not contradict the 'fact' of the difference between Cleric and Lay but gives no reasons apart from the general moral obligation of people in authority to be so much more humble!

(2) The man had been casting out devils, which probably has some connection with teaching; see Mt.7.22; 8.16; 10.1,8; Mk.1.39; 16.17 where casting out devils and teaching are closely connected and Lk.13.32 where Jesus does not include teaching and preaching in a description of his work but calls it 'casting out devils and doing cures'.

(3) Cf. LQH.6.25-27. "And I lea(ned on) thy truth O my God For it is thou who wilt set the foundation upon rock.....to (tes)t the tried stones

In order to (build) a stout bui(ld)i(ng)."

(4) Not administrative office as Michel (Ev. Theol. 2 (1935). p.241): (with Str/Bill.) "Das Bekenntnis begründet also auch die Kirchenzucht und die Lehrautorität des kirchlichen Amts."

supported by what Jesus says to the Pharisees who love the chief seats in the synagogues and the salutations on the marketplace and to the lawyers who load men with burdens, building the tombs of the prophets, (i.e. burying the prophetic testimony under their traditions); having taken away the key of knowledge⁽¹⁾ they entered not themselves and hindered those who wished to enter (Lk. 11.43, 46f., 52). Rengstorff is surely right when he insists that the apostles' office is the same as that of their Lord and that, as a result, "das Schwergewicht der apostolischen Arbeit im Neuen Testament in der Wortverkündigung liegen muss."⁽²⁾

The Authority of the Testimony

The teaching of the disciples concerns what they 'see' and 'hear', things which in the past have been hidden from the wise and the prudent and have been revealed to them; many prophets and kings have desired to see the things which they see and hear the things which they hear, i.e. the things delivered to Jesus by his Father concerning his own person, which he in turn reveals to them (Lk. 10.21-24). The disciples are the eye-witnesses and servants⁽³⁾ of the word from the beginning

(1) Str/Bill. show (I.736-747) that the keys given to Peter symbolise the power given to the steward and from many of Jesus' parables it is deduceable that the steward is the teacher of the Gospel.

(2) Apostelamt und Predigtamt, p. 14; cf. p. 17.

(3) Cf. Ac. 13.36 where David the witness (Heb. 7^ψ; LXX. μαρτύριον (in Is. 55.4 (Σ and Θ have μαρτυρεα)) is said to have served in the counsel of God (ὑπερεστήσας τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ βουλῇ). The counsel of God is his torah or gospel (cf. Dt. 32.28; Ps. 32.11; 72.24; Prov. 3.21 etc.; also Lk. 7.30 and Ac. 20.27 where Paul uses βουλῇ for the gospel which he testifies (vv.21,24) and of which he is a δοῦλος (v.19) and a διακονος (v.24). M. Barth's insistence that the actual seeing, hearing and touching of Jesus by the apostles is the ground of their 'primary and authentic' (Der Augenzeuge, p. 42) authority finds expression in statements like:

(Lk.1.2),⁽¹⁾ that is to say, they are the authorised teachers of Jesus' torah.⁽²⁾ To the disciples, including those who were about him with the Twelve is granted the gift of the of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven (Mt.13.11; Mk.4.10f; Lk.8.10) which is possessed by those whose understanding has been opened by Jesus concerning the fulfilment of the things written in the law, the prophets and the psalms and it is

 "Hätten sie nicht sagen können; Wir hörten, sahen und betasteten ihn, so wäre die Fleischwerdung des Gottessohnes umsonst gewesen für die Wahrnehmung der Menschen." (p. 43) But this is to say no more than that if there is no historical event there is no revelation. The whole point is that everybody saw him and heard him (this thing was not done in a corner (Ac.26.26; cf. Jn.18.20; Ps.97.2ff)), but only some 'saw' his glory. There are few now who deny that a man Jesus actually lived and taught and died and appeared in visions to men after his death.
 (1) Cf. Jn.15.27: "Ye also shall bear witness for ye have been with me from the beginning." Gerhardsson (Memory and Manuscript, p. 243) says: "There can be no question that he is thinking primarily of the Apostles, i.e. the Twelve." The fact is, however, that the question can arise for the early church which did not confine the use of ὑπηρέτης in this way; cf. Jn. 18.37 where it refers to 'everyone who is of the truth' and hears Jesus' voice and especially Ac.26.16 where Paul is given this title and I Cor.4.1 which shows that Paul himself is conscious of his position as ὑπηρέτης and that the phrase is not specially Lucan: ὑπηρετῶν Χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκονομοῦ μυστηρίων Θεοῦ cf. Job 1.3 where ὑπηρεσία = a household, i.e. servants (Heb: עֲבָדִים), Prov.14.35; Sap. 6.4; 16.24.

(2) Goulder and Sanderson (JBS.8(1957). pp. 12-30) have shown that "a high proportion of the events of Lk.1 and 2 is of theological origin" and argue that "it is useless to claim eye-witness authority for the rest" but it is by no means beyond the bounds of possibility that actual events and sayings can be reported theologically; all history is more or less theological if it is a meaningful interpretation of events and not a mere chronicle of them.

these things of which the disciples are to be witnesses (Lk. 24.48).⁽¹⁾ The testimony is something which is given by the Spirit as is made clear by Jesus' words to the Twelve in Mt. 10.18-20;⁽²⁾ it is what Jesus has told them in darkness, i.e. privately (Mt.10.27). Those who receive the disciples receive Jesus and consequently God (Mt.10.40, where 'to receive Jesus' must mean 'to receive his teaching').⁽³⁾ In the post-resurrection commission of the Eleven the testimony is 'everything that Jesus has commanded them' (Mt.28.20). The gospel which Jesus instructs the disciples to proclaim to everyone in the world is something which must carry its own authority; it may be believed or disbelieved (Mt.10.12-14; Mk.16.16 etc.). Simply to have been closely associated with Jesus in his earthly

(1) The disciples in Mt.13.16 are blessed not because they are eye-witnesses but because they 'see' and 'hear' the glory of God in Jesus' person, word and works. Cf. Michaelis, KWB.V. 347.9-44.

(2) Cf. 10.32f. Harnack (Das "Wir" (1910). p. 115) comments neatly that the promise that Christ will confess his confessor almost contains a tautology because Christ speaks and acts in the confessor on earth.

(3) Von Campenhausen (Stud. Theol. (1947/48). pp. 119ff.) is correct in saying that the apostles did not have "eine unbedingte und sozusagen mekanisch wirkende Autorität" (cf. I Cor.7.25; II Cor. 1.13f.) but it is not so certain that there was no uniform apostolic teaching which the community had just to take over as such; Gal.2.5-9 shows that there must have been some basic criterion! Von Campenhausen places the origin of this rationalistic idea in the anti-gnostic struggle in the second century but there were earlier struggles, viz. between Jesus and the Jews, between Stephen and the scribes and Pharisees, between Paul and the Judaizers, between Peter and Simon Magus. There is no reason why the $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta$ τῶν ἀποστόλων (Ac.2.42) should not have been regarded as a simple outline of Dogmatics or a Catechism (cf. Lk.1.4; I Cor.14.19; Ac. 18.25; Gal.6.6) of the early Church.

ministry, to have seen his mighty works and to have heard his wonderful words, to have witnessed his sufferings and even to have experienced his presence after the resurrection are not sufficient in themselves to command acknowledgement of authority (although to have seen and heard is necessary);⁽¹⁾ Mt. writes that some of the Eleven, when they saw the risen Christ, worshipped him but some of them doubted (Mt.28.17) and the longer unauthentic ending of Mk. has it that when Mary Magdalene claimed to have seen him, those who had been with him believed not (Mk. 16.9-11; cf. vv.12f. and Lk.24.10f.) and that Jesus appeared to the Eleven and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart (v.14). There must be a presentation of the evidence, of the phenomena and of the truth enshrined in the phenomena of Jesus' words and works, his crucifixion and resurrection. Jesus in his lifetime and after his resurrection commissions certain people to proclaim this evidence but consciousness of a commission and a claim to have authority to preach and teach and administer the affairs of the church may exist without reference to the testimony which is the truth as it is in Christ. Michel⁽²⁾ avers that the disciples can confess at one time and deny at another because "der Heilige Geist wird nicht Besitz, sondern bleibt Gabe (δοθησεται Mt.10.19)" but the knowledge of the content of the confession does not come and go; it is a permanent possession.

(1) "The historic (geschichtliche) is never without the historical (historische) and does not exist without it." (Althaus, The So-called Kerygma, pp.40f. etd passim).

(2) Ev. Theol. 2(1935). p. 236.

The Transmission of the Testimony

As might have been expected, there is very little information in the Synoptic Gospels about the transmitting of the testimony by the disciples apart from Jesus' instructions concerning this.⁽¹⁾ Mark records (6.12f; cf. Lk.9.6) that when the Twelve go out after their commissioning by the Lord they preach that men should repent and perform healing acts, which two functions together amount to preaching or teaching (Mk.6.30) the Gospel.

The only other passage which affords any information is the prologue to Luke's Gospel.⁽²⁾ When this document was composed, in the lifetime of the first generation of Christians, there was evidently a system of tradition (παρέδοσαν) and catechetical instruction (κατηχήθης)⁽³⁾ and there were in existence many declarations (πολλοὶ... διήγησιν) of the 'things most surely believed' in those days (Lk.1.1-4). If the Gospel according to St. Luke is the content of the teaching referred to then this includes stories about Jesus as

(1) See above pp. 147-151..

(2) Justin Martyr called the Gospels ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων (Dial. 103.8, cf. Apol. 66.3; 66.7; Dial. 100.4). (Noted by Dahl (Stud. Theol. I. (1947). p. 90); cf. p. 91, note 4: "Lk.1.1-4. Les écrits sont un 'rappel' de ce qui est donné dans la tradition et servent à procurer une grande certitude et à prévenir les déformations.")

(3) The basic meaning of κατηχεῖν is 'to sound towards', then it means 'to instruct orally' and thirdly, 'to inform by word of mouth' (Grimm-Thayer, id verb. p. 340). The word occurs 7 times in the NT. In Ac. 21.21; cf. v.24 it is followed by ὅτι, showing that here it has the simple meaning of 'to inform'. In the other 5 occurrences (Lk.1.4; Ac.18.25; Ro.2.18; I Cor.14.19 and Gal.6.6) ὅτι is not used, from which it may be inferred that the word has the second meaning: 'to instruct orally'. The apparent contradiction in Ac.18.25f. is resolved by taking the phrase 'the way of the Lord' as referring to the OT torah.

well as his own words. Farrer assumes⁽¹⁾ that "no one doubted that apostolic authority could be delegated", yet no instances of such delegating is found in the NT; this is not surprising for it would have been tantamount to the apostles' saying to their successors: "We lay hands on you and now people will believe and obey you because we have done this." What actually happened was that Peter and Paul and the others taught their disciples who believed the word; they came under the spell of the authority not of the apostles but of the word, an authority which sprang from the power of the word to supply their need.⁽²⁾ When the disciples were themselves able to teach they would speak with authority but the authority is vested in their word, not in their person as set apart for the preaching and teaching of the word.⁽³⁾

2. The Seventy

In Luke's account of the appointment⁽⁴⁾ of the seventy apostles (10.1-24) there is no specific mention of witnessing but their instructions are the same as those given to the Twelve. They are described as labourers (ἐργάται) (vv. 2.7) who are to announce the nearness of the kingdom as the Baptist and Jesus did and to heal the sick as Jesus did (v.9); their message is Jesus' message which in turn is God's (v.16); their message is the message of the prophet (v.19; cf. Ezek. 2.5f.)⁽⁵⁾ Wiping off the dust against those who will not

(1) The Apostolic Ministry, p.131.

(2) Denney, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Vol.I.p. 151f.

(3) Cf. Schweizer (Church Order 26h): "continuity is essential to the Church of Jesus. But it is the succession of believers, in which the message is handed on from generation to generation."

(4) Ἀναδείκνυμι. John the Baptist's appearance as preacher or witness is described in Lk.1.80 as ἀναδείξις αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς Ἰσραήλ. cf. II Macc.9.23ff; Ac.1.24; I Esd.1.34ff; Dan.1.20 (⊙).

(5) This prophetic note is repeated in v.20: "Rejoice because your names are written in heaven," which is the reverse of the doom pronounced in Ezek.13.9 against false prophets; cf. Jer. 17.13; Dan.12.1.

receive them is not described as a μαρτύριον but the accompanying message is clear: "Notwithstanding be ye sure of this that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you."

The content of the testimony follows the regular pattern:

- (a) the sovereign power of God is referred to (vv.9,11) as are
- (b) the moral demand (implied in the call to repent) (v.13),
- (c) the redemptive action (v.9) and (d) the promise of peace or judgement (vv.5,12ff.).

The authority of the Seventy is the same as that of the Twelve; they are given ἐξουσία over unclean spirits; even the devils are subject to them through Jesus' name.⁽¹⁾

The teaching function of the Seventy is underlined in vv.21-24 where the content of their message is a revelation from God (although they are unlearned νήπιοι)⁽²⁾ through the Son to whom all things have been delivered by the Father.

3. The Leper in Mt.8.24, par.

In the story of the healing of the leper (Mt.8.2-4; Mk. 1.40-45; Lk.5.12-16) the cured man is told by Jesus to show himself to the priest and offer the prescribed gift εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς (Mk.adds: ὁ δε ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον).

(1) This authority is obviously a teaching one. In the OT false gods and devils are one and the same and to drive out the latter is to expel false teaching about God the LORD; cf. Ex. 23.20-25 and the Song of Moses, i.e. his doctrine which is directed towards those who have been instructed by God but nevertheless have sacrificed to devils (Dt.32.2,10,17.) also Ps. 95.3-5 and the connection between the healing of the Gadarene maniac and Is. 65.1-5. In Dt.7.11-15 the healing of sickness is stated to be a consequence of keeping the commandments; cf. Dt.28.58ff.

(2) Cf. Ps.18.8.

Various interpretations have been offered in which the leper testifies to the completion of the cure,⁽¹⁾ the arrival of a prophet,⁽²⁾ the arrival of the Saviour,⁽³⁾ Jesus' support of the Law⁽⁴⁾ or Jesus' fulfilling of the Law in his person.⁽⁵⁾

In accordance with the use of μαρτύριον meaning 'teaching' as already noted it is clear that the action of the leper is to be regarded as a parabolic, teaching one. The incident follows the recognition by Galilee of Jesus' powerful authority and his deliberate parabolic act of healing would be construed as an integral part of his teaching.⁽⁶⁾ The law of Moses concerning leprosy is regarded in Dt.24.8f. as a reminder (!) of what God did to Miriam when she and Aaron the priest spoke against Moses, who was faithful in God's house for a testimony (Heb.3.5); she claimed to be equally a medium of God's torah and was smitten with leprosy herself. It would seem then that Jesus' sending of the leper is his way of saying that the official guardians of Moses' law have wrongly set their tradition in opposition to God's testimony to which he himself had come to testify, concerning which he was a faithful and true witness.⁽⁷⁾ But Jesus has actually healed the plague of leprosy and so behind this passage there lies also

(1) As Gould, St. Mark.ICC.p.32 and Günther: Μάρκος ,p. 70.

(2) Swete, St. Mark. p. 30.

(3) Str/Bill.I. pp. 474f.

(4) Allen, St. Matthew.ICC. p. 75.

(5) Schniewind, Matthaus. p.107.

(6) The herald was told not to say anything himself; he was not an authorised witness but simply a factor in Jesus' testimony.

(7) Cf. Heb. 3.5; Rev. 3.14.

the Messianic⁽¹⁾ thought of Is. 53.1-7 which speaks of the suffering servant who will be led as a lamb to the slaughter, for a truly efficacious sacrifice. It is significant that in the Deuteronomic instruction the cleansing is finally sealed by the slaughter of a he-lamb as a sin-offering. This is what Paul describes as τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (I Cor. 1.6) and τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ whose content is Jesus Christ and him crucified (I Cor. 2.1f.) and ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ (I Cor. 1.18). Thus Cerfaux is correct in saying: "Le texte ne nous fait plus songer à un témoignage" and in the observation: "Il s'agit avant tout l'avenir de l'évangile."⁽²⁾

4. Lazarus

The religious rulers, the scribes and the Pharisees rejected Jesus' authority as their fathers rejected the message of the prophets; and he says to them: Μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι υἱοὶ ἐστε τῶν φονευσάντων τοὺς προφῆτας (Mt. 23.31), echoing the description in Is. 44.9 (Heb.) of those (who do not know God).⁽³⁾ Such culpable ignorance is condemned by Jesus

(1) See Hoskyns in Mysterium Christi, pp. 72-78 for the Messianic significance of Jesus' miracles.

(2) Recueil. I.p. 462; cf. Zad. Frag. 15.7 - 16.3: "And if there be a judgement regarding the law of leprosy which is in a man, then the priest shall come and stand in the camp, and the Censor shall instruct him in the true meaning of the law. And (even) if he is lacking in understanding he shall shut him up; for unto them (i.e. the priests) is the understanding..... He (the Censor) shall instruct the many in the works of God, and shall make them understand his wondrous mighty acts, and shall narrate before them the things of the world since its creation. And he shall have mercy upon them as a father upon his children and shall for(give) all that have incurred guilt. As a shepherd with his flock he shall loose all the bonds of their knots..... oppressed and crushed in his congregation."

(3) Lk. 11.48 has ἅπα μαρτυρεῖς ἐστε (H BL) καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν. The irony of the sentence, in view of Is. 43.10, gives it the same

in the parable of Dives and Lazarus.⁽¹⁾ The former asks that Lazarus be sent to his five brothers ὥπως διαμαρτύρηται αὐτοῖς to which Abraham replies: "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them, if they do not hear them they will not be persuaded though one rise from the dead. Here διαμαρτύρεσθαι is used for the action of one who imparts the basic message of the Scriptures for the glory of God and the salvation of men, a message which depends for its acceptance not on wisdom or force or miracle but on faith and love."⁽²⁾

In Lk. 4.22 the people are said to testify to Jesus (καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ) which probably means simply that they praised him.⁽³⁾

Conclusion

In conclusion, this survey of the Synoptic view of the disciples of Jesus as witnesses shows that the testimony they bear is the doctrine with which they have been entrusted by Jesus, the first form of this, in embryo as it were, is found in the OT; in its complete and final form it is the person of Jesus himself. The authority of the disciples, the witnesses, is a teaching authority which is dependent on the authority of the message which they bear⁽⁴⁾ and it may be accepted or rejected since it has no coercive power. This testimony, while it is a permanent possession of the church and the individual teacher and is to be passed on

meaning as Matthew's. Strathmann, (KWB. IV. 494. 3lff.) regards μαρτυρῶν "im Sinn eines menschlichen Zeugen von Tatsachen."

(1) See above p. 137.

(2) "For the two functions of the preacher's office,....see Acts xx. 21 διαμαρτυρούμενος... τὴν εἰς Θεὸν μετανοίαν καὶ πίστιν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν." (Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 168).

(3) Cf. Gesenius, DCXa; See Job 29.11: יִשְׁתַּבַּח לִי, LXX:

ἐξέκλινε which retains the aspect of 'turning' inherent in שָׁבַח.

(4) Cf. Dodd (History and the Gospel, pp. 49f.): "All the gospel-writers present themselves not as free and independent leaders of thought but as 'tradition-bearers' bound by the tradition."

from person to person is nevertheless a gift of the Spirit, a charisma which does not come and go but which will never pass away (Mt.24.35; cf.Is.51.6-8). Thus authority in the church depends on the faithfulness of the witness to the original testimony of Jesus. A commission from the Lord which is not accompanied by fidelity will end in disaster as in the case of Judas and the unfaithful stewards in the parables but, on the other hand, faithfulness to the testimony without an official commission is allowed by Jesus, which is not surprising for this was his own position vis-à-vis the officialdom of his day.

Those who derive authority in the church from what has come to be known as 'apostolic succession' trace this authority back to the Twelve who, it is said, were given an administrative authority by Jesus but there is no mention of this in the documents of the primitive church. The first preachers and teachers were the natural leaders and became so by virtue of their knowledge of the mind of Christ.

If the first disciples are to be described as the original witnesses and to be revered as the first authorities on this account then it will be necessary to distinguish between *αὐτόπτης* and *μάετος*. If they have authority because they were eye-witnesses of Jesus as a man and a teacher and a healer and so on (one cannot be literally a witness of Jesus' glory in the sense of Mt.16.27; 24.30 so as to be able to present compelling evidence that he is the incarnation of the Creator, Sustainer and Fulfilment of all being) then they cannot, in the nature of things, transmit such authority to a later generation; and, anyway, there were many who had exactly this experience and remained unmoved. If, on the other hand, these first disciples were authorities in the church because they were the first *μάετες* or teachers of the new torah then they had no more authority than any other Christian who possessed the complete testimony and was faithful to it, unless that authority was an administrative authority which was admitted or conferred by the other members (cf. e.g., Ac. Chap.15).

CHAPTER XTESTIMONY OTHER THAN THAT OF THE
BAPTIST AND JESUS IN THE FOURTH GOSPELThe Nature of the Testimony

There are four passages in the Fourth Gospel in which μαρτυρεῖν and μαρτυρία are used in a non-religious sense. The first of these is 2.25 where it is said that Jesus did not commit himself to the Jerusalem crowds who believed in him when they saw the signs which he did because, knowing all things, he knew that he did not need anyone to testify about the human (ἵνα τις μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). This must mean that the crowds believed in Jesus as a wonder-worker but not as the Son of God, the Saviour of the world; it is another way of saying that the knowledge of Jesus is the knowledge of God who sees all things.⁽¹⁾ Simon Magus also believed when he saw the signs which Philip did (Ac.8.13) but subsequently it was evident that he did not have the root of the matter in him. In the second verse, 3.28, John the Baptist reminds his disciples of what he has already said to them about Jesus and his own relationship to him saying: αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς μοι μαρτυρεῖτε ὅτι εἶπον, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός κτλ. ; this use is repeated in 18.23 where Jesus says to the high priest: Εἰ κακῶς ἐλάλησα, μαρτύρησον περὶ τοῦ κακοῦ. The fourth instance is a reference to the rule for legal testimony in Deuteronomy 17.6; 19.15 occurring in 3.28.

(1) Eg. Ex.3.7; Dt. 31.27; Jer. 36.23: καὶ ἐγὼ μάρτυς, φησὶν Κύριος; Ps.43.22: αὐτὸς γὰρ γινώσκει τὰ κρύφια τῆς καρδίας; Ps. 32.13. and see Bernard: St. John ICC.p. 99.

The Samaritan woman is said to have testified (μαρτυροῦσθης) (4.39) that Jesus had told her all her past. Hoskyns⁽¹⁾ contrasts the speaking of the woman and Jesus' teaching but although the woman's testimony is certainly fragmentary it is testimony to the Lord as being omniscient and no doubt also as being the source of saving torah.⁽²⁾ She gives her fellow-countrymen as much as she knows of the testimony of Jesus and later he supports her testimony with his own (4.41f.) - a foreshadowing of the co-witnessing of the Spirit mentioned in 15.26f.⁽³⁾

At 12.17 the very old manuscript p⁶⁶, along with D and L, has the reading ὅτι instead of ὅτε which makes much better sense in view of the οὖν which links the testimony of the crowd with that of the scriptures.⁽⁴⁾ These people who had seen the miracle believed in Jesus (12.11) and acknowledged him as the king of Israel on Palm Sunday; when he fulfilled what was written of him in scripture they also gave the partial testimony that he had raised Lazarus.

The works of Jesus, i.e. his mighty acts of healing (cf. Mt.11.5), are even more important as testimony to the fact that he is an apostle of God than are the words of the Baptist for: Ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου. τὰ γὰρ ἔργα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι ὁ Πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν (5.36).⁽⁵⁾ This idea is repeated in 10.25 where Jesus adds that even his mighty

(1) The Fourth Gospel, p.271.

(2) Cf. Isaiah 12.3; 44.3.

(3) Hippolytus (Contra Haeresin Noeti.XVIII..(Migne: Patrologiae, X.p. 828D) says that Jesus was borne witness to by Anna (ὑπὸ Ἀννα μαρτυρούμενος) a close parallel to the woman at the well for Luke says that Anna spoke of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem (Lk.2.38).

(4) There may be a reference here to I K.2.8 and Ps.112.7 for the NT writers seem to have taken most if not all of the OT references to 'raising' and applied them to the Resurrection.

(5) Cf. Nicodemus' admission that Jesus is a διδάσκαλος come from God since no one could do such signs except God were with him.

works can testify successfully only to those who are his sheep and 'hear' his voice (his words and works are, apparently, the same thing); the words are spirit and life, like the works (6.63).⁽¹⁾

The next testimony mentioned by Jesus is that of the Father himself; this, presumably, is the testimony of God recorded in the Scriptures: καὶ ὁ πέρψας με Πατήρ, ἐκεῖνος μαρτύρηκεν περὶ ἐμοῦ (5.37)..... ἐραυνάτε τὰς γραφάς καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ. (5.39; cf. 8.18: καὶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὁ πέρψας με Πατήρ). It is tempting, following Bernard,⁽²⁾ to take 5.37 as referring to the internal witness of the Spirit of God or as referring to the voice at the Baptism and the Transfiguration but neither would have had any meaning for the people to whom Jesus was speaking. If, following Hoskyns,⁽³⁾ the reference is to the scriptures this is something of which the hearers had experience, like the preaching of John and the works of Jesus. The scriptures themselves are not life-giving but are simply, like John and the signs, a voice directing the reader to Jesus who is able to give life (5.39f.) The content of the testimony of Moses, i.e. the testimony of the OT scriptures,⁽⁴⁾ is Jesus and lack of faith in the one implies lack of faith in the other (5.46f.). 8.18: ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ, καὶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὁ πέρψας με Πατήρ⁽⁵⁾ shows the double testimony to Jesus required by the OT law.

(1) Cf. Bultmann, Theology, II.pp. 59-61.

(2) St. John, ICC, pp. 250ff.

(3) The Fourth Gospel, pp. 303ff.

(4) Cf. 5.39. Strathmann (Das Neue Testament Deutsch, I.(1960). pp.5f.) shows that in references to the OT the part equals the whole and points to its great 'informal' influence on the NT writers.

(5) Dt. 19.15; cf. 17.6; Nu.35.30 and Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, p. 379.

Chapters 13-17 give Jesus' farewell instructions to the disciples. In 15.26f. he tells them that in the days to come he will send them the Παράκλητος i.e. the spirit of truth (cf. 14.17) who proceeds from the Father: ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ. It is probable that here the testimony of the Spirit means the teaching of Jesus which the Spirit will bring to the memory of the disciples (14.26) and which they in turn will transmit to others⁽¹⁾ who will be the fruit of the

(1) Cf. 14.26; Lk. 24.49; II Esd. 19.20; Zeph. 3.7f; Hag. 2.5. Cf. Bultmann (Das Evangelium des Johannes, p. 427): "Wenn, wie Act. 5,32 (15,28), das Zeugnis des Geistes und das der Gemeinde als zwei Grössen nebeneinander genannt werden, so zeigt sich, dass einerseits das Wirken des Geistes kein ungeschichtlich-magisches ist, sondern des selbständigen Einsatzes der Jünger bedarf - und das andererseits die Jünger das, was sie vermögen, nicht aus eigener Kraft vollbringen." Bultmann, however, further on, adds the usual total denial of historicity: "Ihr (the disciples') Zeugnis ist also nicht ein historischer Bericht von dem, was war, sondern - so sehr auch in dem, das war, begründet - es ist "Wiederholung", "Erinnerung" im Lichte der gegenwärtigen Gemeinschaft mit ihm." This is quite wrong and should read "nicht nur" because "historischer Bericht" is certainly included in the apostolic preaching; cf. Ac. 2.22; 3.6 and 4.10; 3.13,14; 4.20; 10.38 etc.

Bultmann (Theology, II. p. 89) gives a very unsatisfactory interpretation of the testimony of the Spirit based on his view that "Jesus brought no 'doctrine' capable of being summarised in propositions; his word..is he himself.....The Spirit's 'testimony'..consists in the fact that Jesus' word is constantly being understood anew while it remains the same." In answer to this it must be said that the Gospels do contain many propositions and narrations of Jesus' activity. If it is true that "Jesus' word is he himself" it is equally true that Jesus himself, his teaching and his parabolic action are the word.

Asting (Die Verkündigung, p. 684 on 14.26) emphasises that the testimony of the Paraclete and that of the disciples are the same thing. Gerhardsson (Memory and Manuscript, pp. 45ff.) shows the amazing capacity for memorising possessed by the rabbis and their pupils which would no doubt be shared by Jesus and his disciples. E.g. "When a rabbi quoted some word of scripture, he had no need to give any reference, since every teacher and pupil had to know where the text in question was to be found."

vine.⁽¹⁾ In this connection there is a passage in the Damascus Document⁽²⁾ which sheds light on the nature of the testimony to be rendered by the disciples whom Jesus has styled 'friends': "Because he (Abraham) kept the commandments of God and did not prefer the desires of his own spirit, he was accounted the friend of God, and transmitted this status in turn to Isaac and Jacob. They too kept the commandments, and they too were recorded as friends of God and as partners in his everlasting Covenant." Indeed the disciples are chosen precisely in order that they may teach others (15.16); they will testify because they have been with him from the beginning (15.27, cf. Mk.3.14) i.e. they have a full knowledge of Jesus' teaching. It is this full knowledge of the testimony of Jesus which gives them their authority.⁽³⁾ Jesus has taught them that they may remember his words after he has gone, for he knows where his way leads (16.4f.). When the Paraclete comes he will guide them into all truth (16.13). Mowinckel's stress on the legal and 'court-of-judgement' aspect of the testifying⁽⁴⁾ is one-sided. Having found the origin of the testifying of the Paraclete in late Judaism, M. sees a development in the NT until, in the Johannine literature, "Der Geist ist nicht der hypostasierte Geist als himmlische Wesenheit, wie im Spätjudentum, sondern der in den Christen Waltende

-
- (1) 15.2,5. Cf. Hoskyns: The Fourth Gospel on 15.5, p. 561.
 (2) In Section ii.14 - iii.12 (Gaster. p. 73) = CD 2.14 - 3.12.
 (3) Cf. Mowinckel, ZNW. 32 (1933). pp. 126f.
 (4) Op. cit. pp. 97-130.

ihr ganzes Christenleben und vor allem die Wirksamkeit und Predigt der Apostel tragende und inspirierende Geist der Wahrheit, der die wahre Religion vermittelt." (p.126; cf.128)
But this is true also of the Spirit's working in Moses and the prophets. One of the primary functions of the Spirit, according to the OT, is to impart the knowledge of God; the accusing and defending is secondary.

In describing the death of Jesus the author shows how it is testified beforehand in the scripture (19.36f.)⁽¹⁾ and makes the assertion: καὶ ὁ ἑωρακὴς μαρτύρηκεν, καὶ ἀληθινὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, καὶ ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθὴ λέγει, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς πιστεύητε (19.35f.). This testimony is not supported by anyone except the Holy Spirit of Jesus, i.e. the scriptures (cf. 15.26f.) (the other disciples had fled and only the beloved disciple was there with the three Marys and the testimony of a woman was not allowed).⁽²⁾

Ἐκεῖνος refers back to Jesus in v.33; if it referred to the disciple then it is difficult to see why οὗτος and αὐτοῦ should be used in 21.24.⁽³⁾

The disciple whom Jesus loved is described in 19.35 as ὁ ἑωρακὴς and in 21.24 as ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ ὁ γράψας ταῦτα and his testimony is guaranteed by the enigmatic 'we' who can only be

(1) Cf. Michel (Ev. Theol. 2. (1935), p. 240): "Das 'Bekentniss' ist die eigentliche Auslegung der Heiligen Schrift."

(2) R.H. 1.8; Sanhed.3.3ff. Photius (Ad Amphilochium Quaestio. CCXVIII) says of Mary Magdalene: ἐνὶ μὲν, ὅτι περὶ αὐτὴν εὐαγγελιστίαν ἐχειροτόνει τῆς ἀναστάσεως (Migne: Patrologia Graeca, CI. 989. 11f.)

(3) Cf. Strathmann, KWB. IV. pp. 504f. and Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, p. 638.

the other witnesses and ministers of the word,⁽¹⁾ the companions of Jesus, the original apostles or men who have believed because of their word, and who, like Paul, are in possession of the truth, although, like Thomas, they have not seen.

"Chapter 21 is the natural conclusion and climax of the Gospel,"⁽²⁾

In 15.26 the testimony of the disciples in the coming days is set alongside that of the Paraclete: καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε, ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔστε.

and its nature is made clear by the following considerations: The testimony of the man cured of blindness is referred to as 'teaching' (9.34) by the Pharisees who, naturally, deny its authority because it does not rest on their tradition (7.49). The disciples' future testimony is to be the reproduction of Jesus' commandments (14.21) or teaching (14.26). This verse is yet another confirmation of the thesis that the testimony of the early Church is something definite and fixed; although it is the work of the Spirit it is not incoherent or arbitrary but is indeed the testimony which Jesus taught, which is also the teaching about his own person and relationship to God and men.⁽³⁾

In the story of Peter's commission to feed Jesus'

(1) Zahn (Introduction, Vol. 3, p. 219 and p. 228, note 14) insists on the meaning of 'eye-witness': "Überall bei Jo wird die sinnliche Wahrnehmung oder doch eine mit dieser vergleichbare und mit deren Namen zu bezeichnende Erfahrung als Voraussetzung der μαρτυρεῖν hingestellt. 1,34; 3,11.32(5.37); 8,14; 12,17 (12,41); 15,27; I Jo 1,1-4; 4,14; Ap.1,2.", but while this cannot be sustained in view of the fact that Jesus' divine sonship is not an observable fact, at the same time the authorship of the disciple is not thereby ruled out. Cf. Harnack, Das "Wir". pp. 107-113.

(2) Cf. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, p. 669.

(3) Michel (Prophet und Märtyrer, p. 48) says that in the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles the testifier is not the one who is gripped by the spirit of prophecy nor who dies the blood-death, but he who has been in company with the historical Jesus, recognises his lordship and now speaks up for this divine truth. This view does not account for all the evidence pointing to the full 'teaching'-meaning of μαρτυρος.

lambs and sheep (21.15-17) the conclusion is inescapable that the feeding refers to teaching.⁽¹⁾ Testifying, in the Fourth Gospel, is also called 'confessing' (9.22; 12.42), a parallel to the Synoptics' εὐαγγελίζεσθαι⁽²⁾, and 'sowing and reaping' (4.35-38; 15.2ff, 16).

The Content of the Testimony

Briefly stated, the content of the testimony above-mentioned is the fulfilment of the torah (1.45). The Holy Spirit will testify of Jesus himself (15.26) as will the disciples (v 27). The disciples are told that they will be reminded of 'all that Jesus has taught' (14.26), i.e. all that he has heard from the Father (15.15).

The Authority of the Witnesses

The witnesses, according to the Fourth Gospel, are those to whom God gave ἐξουσία to become the sons of God (as opposed to the false sons who will not hear the law of God),⁽³⁾ those who 'beheld' his glory.⁽⁴⁾ These men have been chosen by Jesus yet

(1) Cf. Jesus' references in this Gospel to himself (i.e. his message) being the bread of life (6.27-58) also Prov.10.21 (Heb.); Is.14.30; 40.11; 49.9; Jer.3.15: "pastors who shall feed you with knowledge;" Jer.38.10; Ezek.34.2. In Jer.23.1f, 4, 11, 13 the delinquent shepherds are the priests and prophets who have not visited (οὐκ ἐπεσκέψασθε) in whom are transgressions of the law, who prophesy by Baal and lead Israel astray; in place of them God will set up shepherds who shall feed the flock.

(2) Cf. Michel. Ev. Theol. 1. (1935), p.242.6.

(3) Prov.5.7, 13; Is.30.9, 63.8.

(4) Hoskyns (The Fourth Gospel, p.103): "Nor does the authoritative witness of the original disciples lie in what they actually saw, but in what they believed and knew as a consequence of what they had seen" is preferable to Barth (Der Augenzeuge, p. 200): "Das apostolische Zeugnis, das mit dem Evangelium von Jesus Christus identisch ist, ist Zeugnis von dem, was die Apostel sahen. Weil sie sahen was ihre Hörer und Leser nicht sahen, ist ihr Zeugnis einzigartig." "Die Zeit nach der Erscheinung Jesu Christi ist daher", according to B. "die Zeit der grundlegenden und normativen Gültigkeit des apostolischen Zeugnisses vom Fleischgewordenen, der in seiner Herrlichkeit den Aposteln

this is no guarantee that they will be true and faithful (6.70). Jesus has sent these men but one of them will betray him. The application by many scholars of a technical meaning to ἀπόστολος must be less convincing when it is realised that ἀποστέλλειν and πέμπειν are used interchangeably in the Fourth Gospel⁽¹⁾ and elsewhere⁽²⁾ by NT writers. If someone is an apostle when he is 'apostled' whether the word 'apostle' is used or not, then John the Baptist may be called an apostle and so, by the same token, may Ananias of Damascus.⁽³⁾ The disciples were ordained by Jesus to bring forth fruit (15.16), i.e. they have been sent out as teachers (15.27). Just as Jesus was sent into the world by God with the gift of the word so he sent the disciples (17.18,14). The authority of the witness (who must be born again (3.3,5)) is the spiritual authority of the testimony itself, the word of truth which is within him (7.38). Thus he

erschien und von den Aposteln gesehen wurde." This result follows naturally from the error which B. shares with many others, viz. that of failing to see that the main content of the OT testimony concerning the Messiah, that of the Baptist and that of Jesus himself together with that of the preaching and teaching of the NT Church is all the same in principle and that this content is much broader than the mere audible and visible phenomena of Jesus' life. Lightfoot (St. John's Gospel), commenting on "we beheld his glory (1.14) (pp. 84f.), puts the correct view: "The speakers are obviously not mere eye-witnesses in the obvious or legal sense of this word.....The sight - and this includes but must not be confined to physical sight - is sight of the Logos become flesh, become historical.....The seeing...arises from belief."

(1) E.g. 6.38 and 6.57; 13.16; 20.21.

(2) E.g. Ac.15.25,27.

(3) Ac.9.17.

incurs the hatred of the world as did Jesus (17.14).⁽¹⁾ The incident of the Pedilavium shows that in Jesus' mind authority is seen in service rather than in overlordship and privilege (13.13-16). The authority to forgive and retain sins conferred by Jesus on the disciples (20.23) is really the authority to teach or preach the Gospel. There is a strong connection in this passage between the receiving of the Spirit and the authority as there is also in the closing verses of Mt. and Lk. where the function of the disciples is described as teaching all nations and baptising (Mt.28.19f.) and as the preaching of repentance and remission of sins (Lk.24.47). According to Hoskyns v.23 is paralleled in the tradition preserved in Mt.16.19; 18.18 and he quotes Strack-Billerbeck (I.pp.738-747) to show that binding and loosing are technical Jewish terms for forbidding or allowing an action as in accordance with, or not in accordance with, the Law.⁽²⁾ This teaching authority is explicitly bestowed on the first disciples but all Christians have this authority in the degree in which they are acquainted with the testimony. Christ unloosens men's tongues that they may speak in his name..⁽³⁾

The authority of the author of the Fourth Gospel is bound up with that of the apostolic 'we' in which he includes himself and the apostles' authority has been seen to be that of their

(1) The gulf which Torm sees between the author and his Master: "selbst ist er nur der Zeuge; sein Meister ist der Herr der Herrlichkeit" (ZNW.30(1931). p. 132) is not valid, for Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is also a witness - to himself, to the truth. (8.13f; 18.37).

(2) The Fourth Gospel. II. p.653.

(3) Cf. Temple (Readings in St. John's Gospel, p. 386): "This is the primary purpose for which the Spirit is given: that we may bear witness to Christ."

testimony⁽¹⁾ which in turn depends on the testimony of the Holy Spirit which is that of Jesus; as Hoskyns says finely in his The Fourth Gospel. "The Fourth Gospel is less an apostolic witness to history than an Apostolic witness to that which is beyond history (p.66).....Flesh, history, aye, the flesh and blood of Jesus, profiteth nothing, if it be mere observable history, if it be that which was seen by the Pharisees, who also were eye-witnesses, if it be that which was seen by Pilate and by those others who neither believed nor knew. The flesh profiteth nothing if it was seen as flesh even by disciples who were apostles" (p.89). The glory of Jesus which the apostles 'saw' or apprehended (1.14,5)⁽²⁾ "is accessible only to those who believe, and only in this context can the author of the Fourth Gospel speak of knowing or seeing." (p.91).⁽³⁾

The Authority of the Testimony

The authority of the testimony is based on the fact that it is "the words of Jesus" (14.23),⁽⁴⁾ this includes all that he said and did and all that happened to him. Thus the eye-

(1) Cf. Hoskyns (The Fourth Gospel, p. 96): "behind the author of the Fourth Gospel there lies a witness by word and by pen which it is his purpose to preserve and to present to his readers as possessing supreme authority."

(2) Op. cit., p. 98: "this apprehension remained the authoritative basis for his own witness and of the general witness of the Church."

(3) Bultmann (Das Evangelium des Johannes, pp. 45f.) notes correctly that the old controversy as to whether in 1.14 the speakers are eye-witnesses or those who see in a "spiritual" way rests on a false alternative in so far as the character of the seeing is not defined.

(4) Cf. 13.19; 14.29.

witness testimony of the author⁽¹⁾ is also part of the testimony of Christ. It is a spiritual gift in that it is taught by the Holy Spirit (14.16-26; 15.26f; 16.7-11,13,15),⁽²⁾ given by Christ (4.14; 6.27; 10.28; 17.2 etc.); as Mowinckel puts it: The Holy Spirit reveals to the disciples "durch ständige Inspiration den ganzen Inhalt des Christentums."⁽³⁾

The Transmission of the Testimony

That the transmission of the testimony is to be one of the main concerns of the disciples is evident from the following: Jesus says: "If a man love me he will keep my words" (14.23); he commands the disciples to abide in him (15.4) otherwise they will bear no fruit (15.5f.); so far they have kept his commandments (17.6) and they must continue to do so (15.10), as he himself has kept the word which is God's. The author is concerned to pass on this testimony and is at pains to point out that he is a witness that others might come to faith (19.35; cf. 20.31).⁽⁴⁾

(1) Torm (ZNW. 30. (1931), p. 126; cf. pp. 132ff.). "σάεξ war es, was gesehen wurde. Daher muss von einem Augenzeugen die Rede sein oder von einem, der sich als einen Augenzeugen kundgibt." but, of course it was not only flesh that was 'seen'. Torm rightly notes (p.142): "die ὁῶσα offenbart sich in der σάεξ."

(2) "The Rabbinic Holy Spirit is simply the gift of prophecy or divination, regarded as deriving from God." Stewart, (Rabbinic Theology. p. 42).

(3) ZNW. 32 (1933), p. 129.

(4) Cf. Bultmann (Theology of the New Testament. II. p. 73): "The rôle of the believing contemporaries of Jesus is not that they give a certifying guarantee to the faith of following generations by their eye-witness testimony, but that they pass on to them the 'offence' of 'the Word become flesh'." But B. is not correct when he says (op. cit. p. 69): "he (John) does not consider the task of the Church's proclamation to be the transmitting of the historical tradition about Jesus", distinguishing between the testimony of the Spirit and the historical tradition in spite of the fact that both are what Jesus was and taught.

Conclusion

The author of the Fourth Gospel makes reference to many different witnesses who testify that Jesus is the fulfilment of the OT torah or who recall the testimony which he gave concerning his own person. The disciples who are to bear witness are given authority to become sons of God,⁽¹⁾ that is, they are given a teaching authority and the testimony which they are to bear is the teaching of Jesus (14.26) which he in turn has received from God (14.10) and which may therefore be termed a charisma. This spiritual gift is to be a permanent possession; it is definite teaching which is to be passed on that others may be confronted by Jesus, the place of decision. The authority of the disciples is one which they, have not simply because they are eye-witnesses of Jesus' acts and ear-witnesses of his words but because, having seen and heard these, they have perceived the glory of God in the 'flesh' of Jesus and so were able to testify in the Biblical sense.

(1) See Grimm-Thayer, Lexicon on τέκνον at b3 p. 617 and γεννάω at 2b p. 113.

CHAPTER XI

TESTIMONY IN THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES(1) I JOHNThe Nature of the Testimony

I John has three passages which, between them, contain μαρτυρεῖν and μαρτυρία, each six times. The first of these is 1.2: καὶ ἑώρακα μεν καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον. There is no obvious reason for linking the first two verbs rather than the second two; in fact μαρτυροῦμεν really goes with ἀπαγγέλλομεν since they are present tenses while ἑώρακα μεν is perfect, the witnesses being first observers of a fact and then teachers and proclaimers of the truth carried in the fact. The author does not claim any authority on the ground that he has been commissioned by Jesus and any claim on the sole ground that he was a companion of Jesus during his earthly ministry could not have much weight in view of Judas' defection and the fact that Jesus had many hearers and disciples in his life-time who did not go on to testify.⁽¹⁾

That to which the author and his associates testify is stated to be the word of life (1.1), eternal life (1.2), the message (1.5) which they have heard, seen, looked upon and handled.⁽²⁾ This content of the testimony was seen because it was embodied in the man Jesus; it was expressible because he is the word. To have seen and heard Jesus is not necessarily to have 'seen' the word of life (Jn. 9.39; 12.37) although it is possible for Isaiah to have 'seen' his glory (12.41). The

(1) Cf. Jn. 6.66; Lk. 9.57-62.

(2) The object of the verbs 'seeing', 'hearing', 'touching' and 'declaring' in 1.1-3 is the neuter ὅ. The testifying is not to the person of Jesus of Nazareth but to the message of salvation. The next neuter is τὰτα γεάφω (2.1) which is related to the message or commandment (2.7); ὅ appears again in 2.24: ὑμεῖς ὅ ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς where it refers

author's claim is based on the fact that he has 'seen', i.e. has believed the word⁽¹⁾ and now teaches and preaches the same word (1.5). His authority is rooted in the word itself. This authority is not transferable, not because Jesus has now departed and his voice is no longer audible and his body tangible, but because before any other person can speak with authority he must first keep the commandments himself, i.e. 'see' and believe for himself. The testimony must be accepted.⁽²⁾

In 4.14 ἡμεῖς τεθεάμεθα καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν ὅτι ὁ Πατήρ ἀπέσταλκεν τὸν Υἱὸν Σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου is joined by καὶ to the previous verse in which the writer declares that he and his colleagues have been given the Spirit of God. It is because they have this charisma that they have been able to 'see' and therefore to testify that the Father has sent the Son;⁽³⁾ not all men admitted in his life-

to the commandments or teaching of Jesus and possibly also to τὸ χεῖρμα (2.27). Dodd (*The Johannine Epistles*, p. 3) attempts to avoid "the awkward necessity of taking the neuter pronouns in reference to Christ as the Logos" by denying that the clause 'concerning the word of life' is in the same construction as the preceding clauses.

(1) "C'est quand on s'est élevé par la foi au point de vue de l'éternité qu'on dit avec S. Jean en parlant du Christ, 'Nous avons vu et touché le Verbe de vie,' tandis que les Juifs, eux n'avaient vu qu'un corps comme les autres corps." (Laberthonnière, *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne*, 3 (1906-7), p. 72).

(2) "Der das Evangelium derart neu entwarf, dass der Christus praesens den historischen Jesus geradezu aufsaugte, hat sich auch als Augen- und Ohren-Zeugen des Christus praesens in das Evangelium zu stellen gewagt." (Käsemann, *ZThK*, 48. (1951), p. 305).

(3) Westcott (*The Epistles of St. John*, p. 153): "The immediate objects of τεθεάμεθα and μαρτυροῦμεν are different" has failed to see the parallel nature of vv. 13, 14 and that ὅτι in v. 14 is causal, ὁ δὲ δῶκεν and ἀπέσταλκεν being in each case the grounds of the knowing, seeing and testifying.

time that Jesus was even a good man far less the Son of God (Mt.12.24; Jn.8.19). The witnesses have seen Jesus and in him have 'seen' and 'heard' the word of life, i.e. that he is the fulfilment of the torah, the Saviour of the world;⁽¹⁾ they then proceed to testify or to teach this word.

5.6-12 is a passage bristling with difficulties. The first one to present itself is the problem of the Textus Receptus reading at vv. 7f; but as the reference to the testifying of the Trinity in heaven is not found in any Greek manuscript before the 14th century and is first quoted by Priscillian (d.385.) this is certainly a spurious interpolation⁽²⁾.

The next difficulty lies in the reference to the Spirit and the water and the blood. There are three main interpretations: (a) that this is a reference to the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist; (b) that it refers to Jn. 19.34 and (c) that it points to the baptism and death of Jesus.⁽³⁾ It is not impossible that all three sets of ideas were in the mind of the author but it is also not impossible that this man whose topic is the word of life and who must have been well versed in the scriptures should have had in mind the age-old association of the torah with the water of life, e.g. in Dt. 32.2; Ps.35.10 Prov.10.11; 13.14; 16.22; Is.55.1-4,10f; Jer.2.13 etc. and the equally ancient association of the concepts of blood and

(1) Cf. Harnack (Das "Wir", p. 102): "dass 'der Vater den Sohn gesandt hat als Heiland der Welt,' hat mit leiblichen Augen doch niemand geschaut." But Harnack is scarcely right in distinguishing between $\theta\epsilon\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ and $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ since the former has the opposite sense in 4.12.

(2) Cf. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, p. 127, note 1 and for fuller treatment Westcott, The Epistles of St. John, additional note pp. 202-209.

(3) See Brooke, The Johannine Epistles, pp.132-134. and Strathmann: KWB. IV.503.25-38.

life for atonement is closely connected with the μαρτύριον . Also, in Jn.14.6 Jesus says: "I am the life"; in Jn.6.54 he says that the drinking of his blood gives life; in 6.58,63,68 Jesus' words are said to be life.⁽¹⁾ Torah, Spirit and Life are closely connected throughout the Bible (καὶ οἱ τεεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσιν) and so the water, the blood and the spirit may well represent the doctrine or μαρτύριον of Jesus and his Church.⁽²⁾

Καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστὶν τὸ μαρτυροῦν, ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστὶν ἡ ἀλήθεια (5.6). Thus the author ascribes the testifying authority to the Spirit who is like the wind which blows where it wishes (Jn.3.8). Then he proceeds with the parallel statement: ὅτι τεεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ Πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ οἱ τεεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσιν (5.7), that is, all three work towards the same result, the establishing of the truth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.⁽³⁾ The testimony therefore is the same as in 1.2 and 4.14.⁽⁴⁾

In 5.9 the μαρτυρία of God, i.e. the torah of God,⁽⁵⁾ is said to be greater than that of men: εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, λαμβάνομεν, ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Θεοῦ μείζων ἐστίν, ὅτι αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.

(1) Cf. Ro.3.25; Sanday and Headlam, Romans ICC, pp. 87-89 and Grimm-Thayer: Lexicon p. 301b: "Christ, besprinkled with his own blood, was truly that which the cover or 'mercy-seat' had been typically, i.e. the sign and pledge of expiation."

(2) "The emission of the Blood and the Water from the side of the crucified Son of God is the visible expression of the essential Christian truth." (Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, p.636)

(3) Brooke, ICC, p. 137.

(4) Cf. von Campenhausen, Stud. Theol. (1947-48), p. 126.

(5) Cf. Dt. 6.17; Ps.118.2, etc; Ps. 131.12; I Cor.2.1; Rev.6.9. Asting (Die Verkündigung, p. 687), commenting on I Jn.5.9 says well: "Mit 'Gottes Zeugnis' ist auch hier umfassend an Gottes ganzes Offenbarungswerk gedacht, das Jesu Stellung klarmacht, und das dadurch die Heilsgüter, die er bringt, vermittelt."

This is reminiscent of Jesus' reply to the scribe's summing-up of the law: μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστιν (Mk.12.31) and of his words in the Fourth Gospel (5.36) about the testimony which is greater than that of the Baptist, viz. that of his works, i.e. his life and teaching (Mt.11.4f) and that of the word of God in the scriptures (5.37-39), i.e. the teaching of God. Once when Jesus is asked if he is greater than Abraham and the prophets he implies that this is the case because he knows God and keeps his word (Jn.8.52-58); this is the ground of Jesus' authority as of that of his disciples. Finally, in Jn.10.25, Jesus, in answer to the Jews' request to tell them plainly if he is the Christ, says that he has already told them plainly: "The works I do in my Father's name (Mt.11.4f.) bear witness of me." His sheep hear his message and he gives them eternal life (i.e. his teaching). It is the life and teaching of Jesus, the message that he has come to give men the life of God as an inner possession which is the greater μαρτυρία of God, for Jesus knows the teaching and loves God and is obedient even unto death. The greater testimony concerns God's son and is Jesus himself: as v.11 puts it: καὶ αὕτη ἔστιν ἡ μαρτυρία, ὅτι ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῖν, καὶ αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ἔστιν. ⁽¹⁾

I Jn.5.10 states: ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔχει τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐν αὐτῷ. This is a repetition of 2.27 ("But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.") and Jn.16.13. Everyone who has received the anointing or charisma

(1) Cf. Westcott, The Epistles of St. John, p.186a; Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, pp. xxvi, 133.

has the law or testimony of God written in his heart and really needs no teaching, only constant exhortation to abide in it, i.e. to keep on believing in the Son of God. This testimony about the Son of God is the same as believing in the Son of God. The testimony is that God has given life to the writer and the rest of the Church.⁽¹⁾ He who has the Son has the life. The writer of the letter is one of those who have the testimony but, in addition, he proclaims it; he is a teacher.

The testimony, which is ultimately God's testimony (5.9) is a message from or revelation of God; it is the word of life (1.1)⁽²⁾ rather than simply the reporting of events. It is evident from the foregoing that the witness is the apostle or prophet or teacher of the new torah of Jesus. The testimony is called ἀγγελία (1.5; 3.11), ἐντολαί (2.3), Christ's word (2.5), the word of God (2.14), the truth (2.21), doctrine (διδάσκειν) (2.27), prophecy (4.1) and confession (4.2f., 4.15).⁽³⁾

The Content of the Testimony

The content of the testimony remains the same, for the word of life is from the beginning. (a) The idea of the uniqueness and sovereignty of God is there: God is light (1.5); no man has seen him at any time (4.12); he knows all things (3.20); Jesus is the true God and eternal life as opposed to the idols

(1) As Weiss, Die Drei Briefe des Apostel Johannes, p. 146.

(2) This is the message which Jesus himself came to teach (Jn. 6.63). Cf. Dt. 30.19: διαμαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον τὸν τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὸν θάνατον δέδωκα πρὸς προσώπου ὑμῶν, τὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τὴν κατάραν· ἐκλεξάμην τὴν ζωὴν, ἵνα ζῆς σὺ καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου and 32.46f: καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς προσέχετε τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους, οὓς ἐγὼ διαμαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον, ἃ ἐντελεῖσθε τοῖς υἱοῖς ὑμῶν φυλάσσειν καὶ ποιεῖν πάντας τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου τούτου ὅτι αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν.

also Prov. 3.21ff; 4.22; 6.23; 8.35 10.11; Ps. 118.25.40, 50, 88, 93, 116, 149, 156.

(3) Cf. Michel, KWB, 210.5-41.

(5.20f; cf. Is.44.9). (b) Men should confess their sins to God (1.9); God's commandment is the law of love (2.5; 3.11) that the life of Jesus should be imitated (2.6; 3.16); it is the new commandment which is an old commandment (2.7f.) and, since it is the law of love, everyone who knows God wishes to purify himself to be like God (3.3) but sin is still sin (3.8). (c) The redeeming action of God is seen in the death of Jesus on the Cross - the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sins (1.7); he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world (2.2); he was manifested to take away our sin (3.5); he laid down his life for us (3.16); God sent his son to be the propitiation for our sins (2.2 and 4.10), to be the Saviour of the world (4.14). (d) Finally, the promise of God to those who believe is said to be eternal life (2.25) so that they may not be ashamed at Christ's coming (2.28). Those who believe shall be like Christ when he appears (3.2) - indeed they have already passed from death to life (3.14; 5.11-13); they have the faith which is the victory over the world (5.4f.).⁽¹⁾

The Authority of the Author

The author who associates others with himself⁽²⁾ has written this letter to counteract false teaching. The first and

(1) Hoskyns, without enumerating, gives the four-fold testimony in brief: "We are made aware that the readers of the Epistle knew that Jesus had died (c), that he had summed up his teaching in one commandment, namely that his disciples should love one another (b). They knew, moreover, that he had come into the world as the Son of God (a)....that he would come again, and that men would stand before him with boldness or in fear and trembling (d) (The Fourth Gospel, p. 53); cf. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, pp. xxvii - xlii.

(2) Harnack's view is acceptable, that the author from 1.6 to the end of the letter links himself with the fellowship of all believers and not with a special circle (Das "Wir", pp. 102f.) but this does not rule out the existence of such a circle (of teachers). That the readers "durch das Wissen um seine autoritative Persönlichkeit mit ihm verbunden sind" is correct if John's personality is regarded as being dependent on his message. In 1.1-5 H. sees

last verses of the epistle have an affinity with Ps.113.12-16 (cf. Ps.134.13-18) where the idols are described: "They have a mouth but they cannot speak; they have eyes but they cannot see; they have ears but they cannot hear; they have noses but they cannot smell; they have hands but they cannot handle (ψηλαφῆσουσι cf. I Jn.1.1)).....let those that make them become like them (Heb: "they that make them are like unto them") and all who trust them." (cf. Is.44.9). This teacher's authority is that of his message which is from the beginning; Jesus and his message, i.e. the word of God become flesh, are his authority rather than the fact that he has actually seen the historical Jesus⁽¹⁾ or received a commission from Jesus.⁽²⁾ The witnesses declare what they have 'seen' and 'heard', by this they stand or fall.⁽³⁾ Most scholars take the view that, in Dodd's words: "On the face of them, the opening verses taken together seem to imply a distinction between those who had direct experience of the historical facts of the Gospel, and those who knew of them only at second hand, the writer being included in the former class ('we') and his readers in the latter ('you')."⁽⁴⁾ But the author's principal concern is not to parade his authority but to promote

the 'we' as referring to John the author himself and as "ein 'wir' der Autorität "based on his being" Seher, Hörer und Verkündiger des Worts des Lebens."

(1) Cf. Harnack, op. cit., p. 105, note 1.

(2) Cf. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, pp. 43-46.

(3) Schweizer, Church Order is surely wrong in supposing (11.c) that John thinks of the human testimony "almost as an appendage to that of the Spirit (Jn.15.26f)."

(4) The Johannine Epistles, p. 9.

fellowship. Dodd describes the 'we' as being "the preacher's 'we'" when it occurs elsewhere in the epistle but he denies that the 'we' in 4.14 can stand for the author (and his colleagues) as an actual eye-witness of the Gospel facts.⁽¹⁾ His grounds for this are that the preceding verse cannot refer to the writer and his colleagues and exclude the readers. It may be, as Dodd says, "difficult to accept a sudden shift of meaning so radical that, whereas all through the passage 'we' has meant Christians in general, it now means a group of eye-witnesses sharply distinguished from Christians in general" but the readers must already have known the writer as a person of authority and if, as this thesis submits, the witness is the teacher and reminder of truths not yet known or already known, they would have no difficulty in deciding when the author included or excluded them in his use of the first person plural. Dodd's conclusion is correct: "Neither this passage nor any other of those we have examined seems to afford any solid ground for the supposition that the author is thinking in terms of a closed group of eye-witnesses (such as the Apostles) over against the general membership of the Church, or that the pronouns 'we' and 'you' distinguish this closed group from the readers of the Epistle" but there is undoubtedly a difference and this is seen in the teaching authority of the writer and his fellow-witnesses who, as Dodd points out, are not necessarily eye-witnesses.⁽²⁾

(1) Op. cit., pp. 9f., 12.

(2) Dodd (op. cit. pp. 13-15) gives OT precedent for the solidarity of the people of God even over the generations so that Amos could tell his hearers that God had led them forty years in the wilderness and that Joshua can tell the elders of his day: "Thus saith the Lord...Your eyes saw what I did in Egypt." Dodd concludes: "The Church, through its solidarity with the apostles and eye-witnesses, possesses their testimony, and therefore can bear witness before the world to the reality of the Incarnation."

The fellowship which the author seeks to promote is the result of obedience to the message (1.7). He claims to know Jesus but admits that this claim has worth only if Jesus' commands are kept (2.3f.). The commandments which he gives them is not his but Jesus' and they already know it (2.13f.,20); put in another way, the author reminds his readers that they have an anointing or spiritual gift⁽¹⁾ which has given them a complete knowledge of the truth (2.20,27). He himself acts as one who knows no more than they do but whose function it is to keep on reminding them of this knowledge, that is, to be a witness in the original meaning of the word (2.24; cf. Dt. 31.19; 32.46; "the words which I testify...which ye shall command your children to observe to do all the words of this law" and Jer. 38. 31-36).

There are many antichrists who have separated themselves from the fellowship, denying that Jesus is the Messiah and so departing from the original teaching (2.18f.,22-24) and there are many false prophets who are similarly not of God but of the world (4.1-5). The author (with his friends) claims to be of God and says: "He who knows God hears us (4.6). The authority of the witnesses is really the authority of the testimony of the Spirit of God (5.6-11) which is greater than any human testimony and the only authentication of this is the love of God and love of the brethren, i.e. obedience to the great original commandment of God (cf. Mk.12.30f.). Whoever believes that Jesus is the Son of God has the testimony within himself, he has the life of God (5.10-12) and therefore he has authority

(1) There is not a very wide difference of meaning between $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ and $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ but the B reading is preferable since an anointing can hardly be said to abide in someone. Also to be considered is the fact that B^* has $\pi\nu\epsilon\sigma\mu\alpha$ for the second $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$, which makes better sense, for the chrism is less likely to be a teacher than the Spirit.

to speak the testimony if called to do so. The source of authority in the Church is the Lord who has "given us an understanding that we may know him that is true" (5.20)⁽¹⁾

The Authority of the Testimony

The authority of the testimony resides in the fact that it is Jesus' testimony⁽²⁾ and therefore God's testimony and it is the eternal life which was with the Father (1.2); it is the message which Jesus spoke (1.5) and it is a given, revealed thing (1.1-5); it is a χεῖσμα ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἁγίου (2.20). Jesus Christ, now with the Father, is the παράκλητος (2.1) (equivalent to the Holy Spirit) who gives commands, (2.3) i.e. he is the authoritative teacher of the commandment which was from the beginning. The riddle of the paraclete⁽³⁾ is complicated by the frequent conclusion of most that because a substantive which is used by one NT writer is not found in other NT authors or in the LXX therefore it is a particular title with a very special meaning. This is often held even though the verbal form occurs very frequently elsewhere. The author of the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles was well acquainted with the general OT sense of παρακαλεῖν (= to comfort, i.e. to preach the good news of the Kingdom (cf. e.g., Is.40.1) and it is hard to see why he should not legitimately use a noun to denote one who preaches or teaches or testifies the Gospel as in Jn.14.16f. where it refers to the Spirit of truth; 14.26 where it refers to the teacher and reminder; 15.26 where it refers to the Spirit of truth, the testifier; 16.7,13 where it again refers to the

(1) Cf. Prov. 9.10a: τὸ γὰρ γνῶναι νόμον διανοίας ἐστὶν ἀγαθὴς . Note the correspondence between Jer.38.34 and Prov. 24.28 and see above p. 48 note 1 .

(2) Cf. Brooke, The Johannine Epistles, p. 177.

(3) Behm, KWB.V.pp.804. 38-43, 811.

Spirit of truth who will guide the disciples into all truth and I Jn.2.1,3f. where it refers to the one who gives commandments and truth, all of which may be summed up in the phrase 'the testimony of the Holy Spirit'. There would seem to be little need for the introduction of the idea of the Spirit as advocate in spite of the playing of the rôle of intercessor on the part of men like Abraham, Moses, Samuel, Amos and Jeremiah.⁽¹⁾ In his excursus on 'Der Paraklet',⁽²⁾ Bultmann favours the view that "aus der Gnosis aber dürfte auch der Titel παρακλητος stammen, und zwar im Sinne von "Beistand", "Helfer" " and he gives no place to the OT as a source of NT terminology.

The charisma which imparts knowledge to all Christians (καὶ οἶδατε πάντες) (2.20) is an abiding thing and not a fleeting inspiration; it is a complete set of teaching which has existed from the beginning (2.7; 3.11) and any prophet who does not teach that Jesus the Messiah has come in the flesh does not have the spirit of truth (4.1-6).⁽³⁾

4.13f. show that the testimony is a charisma: God has given John and the others his spirit and so they have 'seen' and testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour. This certainly cannot refer to eye-witness testimony - it is the testimony of faith which is the spiritual interpretation of an event in the world of the senses.

(1) Cf. Behm, KWB.V.p.807. 22f. No other NT writer uses the word παρακλητος except the author of the Fourth Gospel and in the four places where it occurs here (14.16,26; 15.26; 16.7) it is used in connection with the teaching of the Holy Spirit to whom it refers.

(2) Das Evangelium des Johannes, pp.437-440.

(3) Cf. Dodd (The Johannine Epistles, pp. 62-64): "His teaching in iv.1-6 is not that doctrine must be tested by inspiration but that inspiration must be tested by the Gospel.....We must suppose that the true unction is also in some way a kind of teaching..... The 'chrism'is the Word of God, that is, the Gospel..... The interior testimony of the Holy Spirit is confirmation of the datum in the Gospel (see iv.13)."

The testimony of the author is the testimony of the Spirit of God concerning Jesus (5.6,9), that is to say, it is the teaching of Jesus in all its aspects, which is a gift of God, the gift of eternal life (5.11).

The Transmission

The transmission of the testimony without addition, diminution or any alteration is one of the primary concerns of the writer. It is precisely that which was heard and seen and handled in the beginning which he declares (1.1-3) and which he would have abide in his readers (2.24,28) that their fellowship may be truly with him and with the Father and the Son. Jesus' commandments are to be kept (2.3). Those in whom the word of God abides have overcome the wicked one (2.14). Whoever abides in God sins not (3.6) but anyone who reduces the content of the testimony is anti-christ (4.1-3).

The witness in John and I John does not provide proof of historicity; what he provides with his testimony is a verbal reproduction of the historical phenomena and his interpretation of them and thus the opportunity for his hearer to perceive the

δόξα Χριστοῦ .⁽¹⁾

(2) II JOHN

II John carries a complex of ideas similar to that of the first letter. Although no member of the μαρτος group is used the testimony is referred to as the truth (1f.), the commandment from the Father (4) which is from the beginning, which is the command to love (5) and to have faith in Jesus Christ come in the flesh (7). Ἐγείρεσθαι is used metaphorically for

(1) Cf. Strathmann (KWB. IV. pp. 503.48 - 504.10) who distinguishes between John's sense of 'witness' and Luke's, the former, according to S., providing the possibility of receiving a direct impression of the δόξα of Jesus....to whom he has no choice but to testify.

testifying or teaching (8) and doctrine which is contrary to that of the writer is called ἕτερα πονηρά (11). The διδάχῃ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ⁽¹⁾ is the ground of the author's authority; he claims no other and associates himself with those who have known the truth; his authority is love for and faith in the message of Jesus and anyone, no matter who he is, who does not bring this teaching is not to be received (10); the important thing is to abide in the teaching (9).

This doctrine is a gift from God (4) and must be adhered to no matter who may teach differently. To find disciples walking in the truth is a source of joy to the writer (4) and the readers must watch ⁽²⁾ themselves (8). The leader by implication (ὁ προάγων) ⁽³⁾ who does not abide in the doctrine of Christ does not have God and is to be shunned (9).

(3) III JOHN

In III Jn 3,6,12 the use of μαρτυρεῖν throws no light on the relationship of testimony to authority. When it is said that the missionary brethren testify to Gaius' having the truth in him this has nothing to do with the preaching of the word except by the indirect reference to Gaius' faithfulness to the testimony of Jesus (καθὼς σὺ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ περιπατεῖς) (3). Here μαρτυρεῖν must mean simply 'to vouch for'.

In v.6 there is a repetition of the above except that here the brethren testify to Gaius' love in acting hospitably to itinerant brethren. In the third instance (12) the elder

(1) τ. Χ. is subj.gen.; cf. Jn.18.19; 7.16 and Brooke, The Johannine Epistles, p. 177.

(2) Cf. Mt. 24.42ff., par; I Cor.16.13

(3) There is no need to confine this to those who are 'advanced' (Brooke and Dodd); according to L.S.(p. 1466. id. verb. II.1) who give: 'lead the way', 'go before' for προάγω.

writes of the good reputation which Demetrius has with everyone and with the truth itself (i.e. with Christ), which probably means that Demetrius' life is transparently in accord with the Gospel. The 'we' most likely refers to those who know Demetrius personally.⁽¹⁾

The Elder may well be one of those teachers who formed a link between the first witnesses and the next generation⁽²⁾ and Gaius one of his disciples (4) who is preserving the original testimony in face of opposition from Diotrephes. Käsemann's thesis⁽³⁾ that the Presbyter is an excommunicated Christian Gnostic is not very attractive in view of the inclusion of the letter in the canon but K. is correct in seeing John as being in line with the earliest Christendom which "hat jeden Christen Geistträger sein lassen und Autorität nicht auf dem Amt, sondern dem Dienst gegründet."⁽⁴⁾

(1) Brooke, The Johannine Epistles, p. 194

(2) Euseb., Eccles. Hist. 3.39.3f.; Iren., Adv. Haer. 5.36; cf. 5.33.3, cf. Dodd; The Johannine Epistles, pp. 155f.

(3) ZThK. 48 (1951), pp. 292-311. esp. p. 301: "Die Pointe liegt, wenn meine Beweisführung zutrifft, ja eben darin, dass dieser Presbyter exkommuniziert und darum notgedrungen ein Einzelgänger ist." and p. 302: "Der Presbyter ist ein christlicher Gnostiker, der die geradezu unvorstellbare Kühnheit besitzt, ein Evangelium des von ihm erfahrenen, in die Welt der Gnosis hineinsprechenden Christus zu schreiben.....Von der Orthodoxie ausgestossen, hat er zugleich den schärfsten Kampf gegen die doketistische Gnosis führen müssen." and p. 311: "Zweifelloos ist der Presbyter ein christlicher Gnostiker."

(4) Op. cit. p. 311. Rendel Harris remarks pertinently: "No one ought to acknowledge the genuineness of the third epistle of John, with its unmeasured railing at the man who loves the primacy, and hold that the monarchical episcopate was an apostolic authority." (The Expositor. Ser. 3. Vol. 5. p. 227.)

Conclusion

The claim of the author of I John to declare the word of life is not based simply on the fact that he has seen Jesus in the flesh but that he has seen him and believed that he is the Word, that his blood cleanses from sin those who walk in his light. The author and his fellows may be contrasted with the Pharisees who although they could see and hear Jesus physically were spiritually blind and therefore their sin remained (Jn.9.40f.).

The testimony of the Spirit is the teaching of God, a gift which is imparted by God and which shows the same four-fold content as in previously studied documents. In I John the testimony is an anointing which teaches^(I Jn. 2.27) and is something which abides (II Jn.2ff.) and must be preserved complete for there are many false teachers.

CHAPTER XIITESTIMONY IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLESThe Nature of the Testimony

In Acts, Luke employs *μάρτυς* and *μαρτυρεῖν* in the legal sense in 6.13; 7.58; 22.5 and 26.5. *Μαρτυρεῖσθαι* meaning to be well reported occurs in 10.22; 16.2; 22.12. The tent of witness (*ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου*) is mentioned in 7.44. Seven times in the first ten chapters (1.8,22; 2.32; 3.15; 5.32; 10.39,41); Peter and his fellow-apostles are given the title *μάρτυς* (Paul also uses this word to describe them in 13.31;⁽¹⁾ their action is represented by *διαμαρτυρεῖσθαι* (2.40, 8.25)⁽²⁾ and once by the phrase: *ἀποδιδόναι τὸ μαρτύριον* (4.33). Paul is given the title *μάρτυς* (22.15; 26.16); for this work as a witness Luke uses *διαμαρτυρεῖσθαι* (18.5; 20.21,24; 23.11; 28.23) and *μαρτυρεῖν* (20.26; 23.11; 26.22) and, for his testimony, *μαρτυρία* (22.18).⁽³⁾

(1) Von Campenhausen (*Die Idee*, p. 34) speaks of "Die fast ängstliche Gewissenhaftlichkeit, mit der Lukas den Zeugentitel auf die Augenzeugen im buchstäblichen Sinne des Wortes beschränkt", but the plain fact is that in the LXX, from which the NT so largely borrowed its language and thought, *μαρτυς* does not mean 'eye-witness' and Luke uses *αὐτόπτης* only once, in the prologue to his Gospel and there the phrase is *αὐτόπτης ... τοῦ λόγου*. See also above p. 181, note 3.

(2) Cf. Asting (*Verkündigung*, p. 614): "Wenn Gott für einen Menschen Zeugnis ablegt so bedeutet das, dass Gott anerkennt, dass der Wille des Betreffenden in Übereinstimmung mit seinem Willen ist. Damit wird der Betreffende als ein besonderes Werkzeug Gottes bezeichnet."

(3) *Μαρτυρίαν* here means 'testimony' rather than 'testifying' since *παράδεχσθαι* means 'to receive by way of tradition' (LS.p. 1308.1.a); cf. Mk. 4.20 which speaks of receiving the seed of the word, and Ac. 16.21.

Stephen also is called a μαρτυς in 22.20. Μαρτυρεῖν or διαμαρτυρεῖσθαι are used for the divine testifying in 13.22; 14.3; 15.8 and 20.23, μαρτυρεῖν for that of the OT prophets in 10.43 and μαρτυρεῖσθαι ⁽¹⁾ for the testifying of the men who are to be chosen to serve the tables in 6.3.

Peter and the Galilean Disciples

In the Peter passages ⁽²⁾ the reference seems at first sight to be to eye-witness testimony ⁽³⁾ but on closer inspection this is not necessarily so. ⁽⁴⁾ In 1.8 the risen Christ tells the apostles that they will be his (μου) witnesses, a function which would appear to be dependent on their receiving sometime in the future (λήμψεσθε) the power of the Holy Spirit which will enable them to prophesy (Ac.2.18). The witnesses

(1) See above p. 11, note 14.

(2) Menoud (Eglise et Théologie, 68 (1960). pp. 9f.) has pointed out how only the witnesses Peter, Stephen and Paul are given speeches in Acts and that Barnabas and Philip are not reported, but this may well be because Luke had to limit his material to a manageable amount and his purpose was served if he gave the 'evidence' of the maximum number of witnesses required by Jewish law.

(3) Strathmann (KWB. pp. 496 f.), with most, sees Luke as trying to establish and historically guarantee the testimony of the apostles by producing eye-witness testimony. Cf. von Campenhausen, Stud. Theol. (1947/48), p. 126.

(4) Asting (Die Verkündigung) sees Ac.1.8 as carrying an idea similar to that in Is.43.10 etc., that the eye-witness idea is present but not decisive. "Es ist bedeutungsvoll, dass in dieser Verbindung betont wird, dass diese Stellung als Christi Zeugen in der Welt auf einer Gabe des Geistes beruht." (p.601).

are thus counterparts of those in Is. 43.10,12; 44.8, the seed of Jacob (12 in number (!)) upon whom God will put his Spirit, the people whom God has chosen.⁽¹⁾ When v. Campenhausen says: "Der Glaube an Jesus als den Christus steht und fällt mit der Wirklichkeit seiner Auferstehung, und diese wird darum auch vor Juden und Heiden in der Missionspredigt vor allem anderen 'bezeugt'",⁽²⁾ the question must be raised: "What does he mean by Glaube, Wirklichkeit and bezeugt?" If the faith can be proved by an event which may be sensibly perceived then it cannot mean ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων (Heb.11.1), and therefore cannot be the kind which Jesus himself demanded. Those who are concerned about proof for things spiritual lay much stress on the idea that the apostles were eye-witnesses of the Resurrection,⁽³⁾ sole eye-witnesses of the revelations of the Risen Lord"⁽⁴⁾ but it is

(1) Cf. Sir. 45.1-5,17 where it is said of Moses: "(God) chose him out of all flesh. He made him to hear his voice....and gave him commandments face to face, even the law of life and knowledge, that he might teach Jacob the covenant, and Israel his judgements", and of Aaron. "He gave unto him in his commandments, authority (ἐξουσία) in the covenants of judgements, to teach Jacob the testimonies, τὰ μαρτύρια, and to enlighten Israel in his law."

(2) Die Idee, p.31.

(3) Cf. Hastings (Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem, pp. 27f.): "The proof of Jesus' claim to Messiahship lay in the Resurrectionat first the Christian witness (μαρτύριον) was rather different from the preaching (κήρυγμα) ...the former was especially the work of the Apostles, the latter of every accredited Christian minister." On p. 158 H. says that the prime activity of the Apostles was to witness to the Resurrection as proof (!) that Jesus was Messiah and follows this with: "This witness was destined to produce faith (!)."

(4) Riesenfeld, The Ministry in the New Testament, p. 120; cf. Kittel (The Jesus of History): "An apostle was a leader because, and insofar as, he was able to answer questions concerning the Jesus of History." (p.34): "because in this historical condition lay the certainty of faith." (p. 35). It should always be made

not easy to understand how faith can be strengthened by sight. If there is a literal seeing of Jesus as divine this displaces faith (Ro. 8.24)⁽¹⁾. This is not to deny that the disciples saw what Jesus did and heard what he said and that they faithfully transmitted their evidence but this evidence is still only a 'sign'. The 'signs' however, are important and necessary for they are the raw material which points to the possibility of faith or unbelief on the part of those who hear the testimony; in transmitting the testimony of the actual words and works of Jesus the disciples are confronting their hearers or readers with the Jesus whom they knew in the flesh, with the challenge of his claim and the necessity for decision, in short with the experience which leads to faith or unbelief, obedience or disobedience, life or death. To have seen the historical Jesus

perfectly clear that eye-witness testimony about Jesus is not a proof of anything except of what Jesus was, did and spoke as a man; it simply confronts people with the figure and work of Jesus after which they must choose or reject. The inaccuracy of Kittel's view is seen in his statement on p. 49. "If the Jesus of history were in very truth the Christ of God, then his history with all its humiliation and contingency was the revelation of God and faith alone has the eye to see this." It is hard to understand how there can be Revelation without a revealing and there is no revealing without faith, therefore the history of Jesus is not Revelation for some people even though it may be for others.

(¹) Dodd's view (The Johannine Epistles, pp. 104-6) that apostles differ from prophets who were not apostles "because the former were primary witnesses to the evangelical facts and have the authority embedded in the apostolic witness to the Gospel" is under obligation to explain the phrase 'witness to the Gospel'. The view of the present thesis is that the *μαρτυρ* is a witness who reminds in the prophetic sense rather than one who testifies in the legal sense. The NT witness is a witness in the legal sense only to the words and works of Jesus, not to the Gospel whose truth must be believed; this is just as true for the Twelve as for other preachers. Nor is it possible to accept Morgenthaller's dictum: "für Lk., die Auferstehung des Jesus von Nazareth eine höchst reale, historische Tatsache ist" (Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, p. 26) and "In der

does not give stronger grounds for believing in him as Saviour and Lord than to hear the testimony concerning him; in each case there lies the other possibility of seeing him as a 'Skandalon'.

In the account of his election⁽¹⁾ Matthias takes over Judas' ἐπισκοπή⁽²⁾ to become {⁽⁴⁾ γενέσθαι } a witness⁽³⁾ of the raising of Jesus. This action is justified by quotations from Ps.68.26 and Ps.108.8: Τῇ

Tatsache der Auferstehung liegt der Beweis, (!) dass Jesus der Sohn Gottes...ist." (ib.p. 28).

(1) Stauffer's comment on Ac.1.12-26 places the election of Matthias in the tradition of Jewish legalism: "Der Bericht über den ältesten Rechtsakt der Jüngergemeinde ist völlig durchsetzt von den Begriffen, Formeln, Grundsätzen und Praktiken der vorchristlichen jüdischen Rechtstradition. (Jüdisches Erbe im urchristlichen Kirchenrecht, p.204). This may be true for the formal bringing-up-to-strength of the roll of the Twelve as the representatives of the new Israel but the function for which Matthias was chosen, to be a witness of the resurrection, is of a missionary rather than a legal nature.

(2) Cf. Heb.12.15 where ἐπισκοπεῖν is used for the protecting of the teaching.

(3) There is a general tendency to think that Luke sets up the apostles as the guardians by virtue of their eye-witness testimony, e.g. Käsemann (Ketzer und Zeuge, p. 305, n.4) states: "In schroffem Gegensatz dazu (i.e. to the Johannine view that the eye-witnesses of Jesus' glory never cease) entwirft Lukas seine Konstruktion einer immanenten Heilsgeschichte: Die Historie Jesu wird von den Aposteln als alleinigen Augenzeugen der Kirche vermittelt und garantiert, die als Heilsanstalt und Hüterin dieser Tradition Anteil an der Heilsgeschichte gewährt." K. continues (ib. p. 306): "Die Apostel sind ja bereits für die Pastoralen und die lukanischen Schriften nicht nur Garanten der kirchlichen Überlieferung, sondern zugleich Begründer des kirchlichen Amtes und seiner durch die Ordination vermittelten Sukzession....Die Tradition legitimiert hier das Evangelium." But eye-witness testimony of facts cannot guarantee the truth of the Gospel - and it can guarantee the historicity of the facts only when it is believed.

(4) It may be that not only in 3.22; cf. v.26; 5.30 and 13.33 but also here and in 2.32 ἀνάστασις refers to the coming of the prophet foretold in Dt.18.15f: προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου

ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λαβέτω ἕτερος. The ἐπισκοπή is equivalent to the διακονία and ἀποστολή of 1.17,25 and 6.4⁽¹⁾ which may be an echo of the Levites' λειτουργία ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου (Nu.18.21-26). Is.22.15-25 provides an interesting parallel in the story of Somnas the ταμίης (= treasurer (cf. Jn.12.6), overseer, steward) who is removed from his οἰκονομία which is given into the hands of another. The casting of lots for the position is clearly based on the precedent of I Chron.25.8. All this serves to show that in the mind of Luke the ἐπισκοπή, διακονία, ἀποστολή and οἰκονομία mean much the same thing and, since Matthias by taking over the ἐπισκοπή of Judas is to become⁽²⁾ a

ὡς ἐμὲ ἀναστήσει σοι Κύριος ὁ Θεός σου. NB. Luke distinguishes carefully between the raising of Jesus and the raising of Jesus from the dead in Ac.13.33f. At any rate, Reid is surely right in saying: "It is pretty evident that this witness to the resurrection has to be taken broadly. It is not simply a matter of pointing to the resurrection as something that has taken place of which the witness is trustworthy evidence. The witness is to be one who not only knows the resurrection but has had close and prolonged contact with our Lord himself throughout his life. It is the resurrection, therefore, of one whose life and ministry the witness intimately knows that is to be content of his witness: his ministry is to be witness not so much to the resurrection as to Jesus resurrected, with all that this includes." (The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry, pp.13f.). Here, however, the difficulty occasioned by Luke's use of μάρτυς for Paul and Stephen is not helped and it would seem that the only way to resolve it is to regard the μάρτυς as the teacher or preacher of the testimony of God rather than as witness of facts; doubtless Luke who could employ the term for others beside the Twelve was aware of this!

(1) Cf. Kittel (KWB. IV.116.10f.): "'Dienst am Wort' ist danach für diese Kapitel der Ag. nichts anderes als Zeugnis und Botschaft von Jesus."

(2) Nineham (Eye-witness Testimony and the Gospel Tradition in JTS.9(1958), p. 14) writes: "At every stage in its history the early church was in fact interested in eye-witness testimony about the Lord. At the very beginning when a successor was chosen for Judas, we are told that what was needed was a witness

witness of the raising it would appear that this does not necessarily mean an eye-witness.⁽¹⁾ In the first place, Judas whom Matthias replaced did not witness the phenomenon of the resurrection and in the second place the *μάετος* must be one of those who had gone with Jesus during his teaching ministry,⁽²⁾ i.e. from his Baptism to his Ascension, until

of his resurrection." But as has been pointed out already Judas was not a witness of the resurrection of the crucified Jesus and *μάετος τῆς ἀναστάσεως* does not necessarily mean more than 'a proclaimer of the truth that the man Jesus is the Messiah.' Nineham admits in a footnote that *μάετος* has a wider connotation than *αὐτόπτης* and proceeds: "But the qualifications for the *μάετος* in this passage show that here at least *μαρτυρία* was felt necessarily to include *αὐτοψία* and that also appears to be the implication in other passages in Acts." - except those referring to Paul and Stephen, accounts of whose testifying take up more of the book than those of the Twelve's! There are, of course, references to the things which Paul saw and heard but he himself describes his experience as a vision (*ὄψιασμα*) (Ac. 26.19) and Stephen's vision follows his testifying. Sasse (Jesus Christ the Lord, p. 99) states incorrectly that, as related in Ac. 1.22, it was a condition of the apostolate to have been 'a witness of the resurrection'. The fact is that this is not a condition but a consequent function of the prophetic or apostolic call. Rengstorff (Apostleship, p. 52) having cited the possession of eye-witness testimony as a decisive qualification for apostleship makes the curious statement: "The apostle of Jesus is always a witness of historical facts, not a teacher of myths: fully conscious indeed that what he proclaims is a contradiction of all human experience." R. thinks that the objection to Paul's claim to be reckoned an apostle along with the Twelve "has obviously a partial justification" (ib. p. 53) but Paul was certain that it has none whatsoever!

(1) Cf. v. Campenhausen, Stud. Theol. (1947/48), p. 113, incl. note 3.

(2) Goguel (L'Eglise Primitive pp. 97f.) says well: "L'autorité supplémentaire attribuée à ceux qui avaient accompagné Jésus pendant son ministère, ne paraît pas avoir été justifiée par l'idée qu'ils auraient mieux que tous autres connu sa pensée et compris son enseignement. Toute argumentation que Paul développe dans l'épître aux Galates exclut l'idée que les Jérusalémistes se soient, pour demander le maintien du

which time he was still teaching them διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου (Ac.1.2) about the things pertaining to the kingdom of God (1.3).⁽¹⁾

Strathmann⁽²⁾ sees a transition in Luke's usage from the witness of fact to the witness as bearer of a message, i.e. from the Twelve to Paul, but it would seem that the essential thing to try to show is not that Paul was a witness as the Twelve were but that the Twelve were witnesses as Paul was.⁽³⁾ That to which the Twelve testified was not simply factual evidence seen by the eye and heard by the ear but God's revelation which is perceived by faith. The experience of being with Jesus is a necessary first step but after the spiritual significance of the fact is believed the possession of eye-witness experience

ritualisme juif, appuyés sur l'enseignement et sur l'exemple de Jésus." But G. is surely wrong when he adds subsequently: "Dans la plus ancienne conception, l'apostolat des Douze ne se justifiait pas par l'idée que les apôtres avaient été les témoins de l'enseignement de Jésus et les dépositaires de sa pensée." It was their being the depositories of Jesus' testimony which gave them any authority they had. Cerfaux comments correctly: "Le témoignage de la résurrection s'élargit donc à la mesure de toute la carrière du Christ. En arrière, il embrasse ses miracles et sa prédication....en avant, toute l'oeuvre du salut inaugurée par la résurrection." (Recueil. II, p. 159). To be a witness of the resurrection Matthias had to be "qualified to transmit the holy tradition of the words and deeds of Jesus" (Riesenfeld, The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings, p. 21).
 (1) Schweizer (Church Order, 3n) points out that "the importance soon obtained by the Lord's brother James...probably shows that the testimony about the earthly Jesus by those who had seen and heard him is not very vital for the primitive Church." The best explanation, however, of the subsequent silence concerning the Twelve is that the testimony about the earthly Jesus was of the highest importance but the bearers of it were not; once they had established the testimony in the Church their authority was no greater than that of other preachers and teachers.

(2) KWB. IV, 497.20 - 498.29; cf. Rigaux, Thessaloniens, pp. 154f.

(3) Cf. Munck, Petrus und Paulus in der Offenbarung Johannis, p. 17, note 18.

gives no superior authority. When Rigaux⁽¹⁾ says: "Paul n'est pas témoin ni de la vie, ni des souffrances, ni des événements de la résurrection" he disregards the very practical consideration that it would have been impossible for Paul to preach and teach a gospel of Jesus Christ without some knowledge of and reference to the events of Jesus' life and his teaching. Paul reminds the Thessalonians (I.1.6) that they became imitators of himself and his friends and of the Lord, which presupposes some knowledge of the Lord and of his ways, and they are to stand fast in the Lord (I.3.8), which must mean 'in his teaching'. Paul's commands are 'by the Lord Jesus' (I.4.2) which must mean 'according to Jesus' commands'.

In Peter's sermon in Chapter 2 the testimony is identified with prophecy; in vv.17f. Peter explains the speaking with other tongues of 2.4 by quoting Joel's words about the people of God prophesying. There is at the beginning of the chapter a very strong echo of Ps.49.1-7, a picture of God coming in fire and tempest to testify to his people. In 2.4 the disciples were given utterance by the Holy Spirit; ^{ἑδίδου} ἀποφθέγγεσθαι, an example of which utterance is given by Peter: ἀπεφθέγγατο (2.14ff.);⁽²⁾ this is also called prophesying under the inspiration of God (2.17f.). Peter in 2.29ff. quotes a promise in Ps.131.11 to prove that Jesus is Christ. The promise runs: "Of the fruit of thy body will I set (a king) upon thy throne. If thy children will keep my covenant, and these my testimonies (μαρτύρια) which I shall teach them."⁽³⁾ It is clear then that when Peter

(1) Thessaloniens, pp. 156f.

(2) Behm (KWB).I, 448). "In sensu bono von geisterfüllten Christen, ekstatisch Erregten." 'Inspired' would be better than 'ecstatic' which gives the impression of uncontrolled emotion on the part of one who is beside himself.

(3) Cf. Is.59.21. Note the similarity between Ac.1.1f. and Josh. 23.14-16.

describes himself and his companions as witnesses of Jesus⁽¹⁾ whom God has raised he is referring not so much to eye-witnesses⁽²⁾ as to those who are true to the torah of God⁽³⁾ and teach the doctrine acted and taught by Jesus; this is to the effect that he is the Lord,⁽⁴⁾ the son of David who gives the law, redeems on the cross and is raised by God.⁽⁵⁾ They

(1) Lake and Cadbury (The Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I, Vol. IV, p. 25) recognise the ambiguity and give evidence for 'witness of Jesus' and 'witness of the resurrection'.

(2) Against Reicke (Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde p. 48): "Dass der Davidssohn und Messias, von dem David in Ps. 15(16) gesprochen hat, eben mit dem Herrn der Christusgemeinde identisch ist, wird nach v. 32 (chap 2) noch durch Jesu Auferstehung bestätigt. Diese wiederum ist deswegen eine gesicherte Tatsache, weil Petrus und die anderen Apostel sie erlebt haben und dafür Augenzeugen sind. So soll hier das eine Argument durch das andere gestützt werden." On p. 102 R. talks of "seine Erhöhung, deren Wirklichkeit nach v. 32 durch die Augenzeugen und das Vorhandensein des Geistes bezeugt wird."

(3) Cf. the testifying of Peter: $\Sigma\omega\theta\eta\tau\epsilon\ \alpha\pi\omicron\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\kappa\omicron\lambda\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ (Ac. 2.40) and the $\mu\alpha\epsilon\tau\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$ -Song of Moses which states that God is faithful, just and holy but men have sinned..... $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\alpha\ \sigma\kappa\omicron\lambda\iota\alpha$ (Dt. 32.4f.).

(4) Günther (Μάριος, p. 108) admits "dass sich das urchristliche 'Zeugnis' sehr bald zu einem 'Kerygma' ausgeweitet hat aber das ist für den Bedeutungsinhalt doch gar nicht ausschlaggebend." On pp. 108f. G. supposes a development to have taken place from 'testimony to the resurrection' to 'testimony which is the preaching of Jesus Christ' but the content of the testimony was always broader than the resurrection. Hastings (Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem, p. 28) also distinguishes between $\mu\alpha\epsilon\tau\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$ and $\kappa\eta\rho\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha$.

(5) Cf. Nathan's message from God to David in II K. 7.12f: $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \sigma\acute{\epsilon}$, $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\omicron\iota\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega\ \tau\eta\nu\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$. $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \mu\omicron\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\ \tau\hat{\omega}\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\rho\theta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\alpha$.

are, in short, the teachers of the whole Christian message.⁽¹⁾ That the apostles are, in fact, the first accredited teachers of the church is made clear in Ac.6.4 where their work is called διακονία τοῦ λόγου, i.e. of the μαρτύριον the gospel of Jesus, the prophecy of Jesus (cf. Rev.19.10).

In 2.40 Luke uses διαμαρτύρεσθαι, to describe Peter's preaching⁽²⁾ outlined in the preceding verses.⁽³⁾ In 3.12-15 Peter identifies Jesus with the Servant of Isaiah chaps. 52ff. who in 55.4 is called a μαρτύριον or μάρτυς⁽⁴⁾ and so the apostle can describe himself and his fellows as his

(1) Cf. Gerhardsson; Memory and Manuscript, p. 71; Cerfaux (Recueil, II, pp.161-3) and Hastings (op. cit. p. 28) see a distinction between testifying to the resurrection which is directed to the Jews and 'the message' which is delivered to the Gentiles, but this distinction is weakened by four appearances of the μάρτυς-group in the story of Cornelius who was not a Jerusalem Jew and to whom Peter testifies. C. indeed admits "quelques inévitables confusions", in particular 5.42 (28.23 might also be cited) and reverses the order of διαμαρτυρέμενοι and λαλήσαντες τὸν λόγον to fit his argument.

(2) Rétif (Témoignage et Prédication, p. 157, with note (16)): "le mot διαμαρτυρομαι, propre à Luc et à Paul, nous apparaît éminemment kerygmatic.".

(3) Braun's claim (Theologische Literaturzeitung, 77 (1952), 533) that only in μαρτύριον and μάρτυς in Acts, not in the verbs, is there a close connection with the resurrection, and that the verbs are used parainetically is an assumption which cannot be sustained in view of 2.24-31, being part of the content of the testifying. Lake and Cadbury (Beginnings, Pt. I. Vol.IV, p.27) comment: "If it means more than 'testifying' it may be 'to testify by argument'. cf. διαλέγεσθαι. Günther (Μάρτυς p. 124) also excludes the resurrection from the content and confines διαμαρτύρεσθαι to the preaching of Judgement. Cf. Haenchen (Apostelgeschichte, p. 647, note 1): "διαμαρτυρομαι ist(vgl. Strathmann Th. Wb. IV, 518f.) in der Apg. eins der Worte, welche die christliche Verkündigung bezeichnen; vgl. 2.40; 8.25; 10.42; 18.5; 20.21,24; 23.11.

(4) See above p. 59.

witnesses(3.15).⁽¹⁾ It is this μαρτύριον ⁽²⁾ which the apostles render to their own company with great power (4.33, a verse which recalls 4.31⁽³⁾ where they are described as speaking the word of God with παρηγορία, having been filled with the Holy Spirit). This is a concomitant which would scarcely be required if the content of the testimony were simply the fact that they had seen Jesus after he had returned from the tomb. ⁽⁴⁾

In 5.30 the sequence of thought is significant: (a) God must be obeyed; (b) God raised Jesus; (c) you slew him; (d) God has exalted him;⁽⁵⁾ Peter declares that the disciples are witnesses of these things. The first statement about Jesus must refer to the inauguration of his ministry.⁽⁶⁾ In this verse the witnesses testify to all the events of Jesus' life, i.e. the whole of God's testimony. Also the Holy Spirit is a co-witness, a further confirmation that the witnesses are to be

(1) Not witnesses of the fact of the resurrection (as Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 110) which would require ἡς. Cf. Haenchen (Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 166): "Sie wird in dieser Rede nicht wieder durch den Schriftbeweis gesichert, sondern durch das Zeugnis der Augenzeugen." This is surely wrong if only in view of 4.33. Eye-witness testimony is not really substantiated by miracles!! - and besides, people other than Christians did miracles.

(2) Cf. Cerfaux (Recueil.II, p. 158): "On ne peut escamoter l' article."

(3) Cf. 4.33 where τ.Κ.Ι. goes with ἀποστόλοι rather than with ἀναστάσεως, with the B reading. p and others have corrected to τ. ἀν. τ. Κ.Ι Χριστοῦ.

(4) See above p.238 note 4. In any case the content of μαρτύριον is much more than just 'resurrection' as is shown by vv.24ff. Schweizer (Church Order, 24a) takes Ac.4.31 as referring to the Church, separating it from 4.33 which refers to the apostles who are specially witnesses of the resurrection; but the testimony of the resurrection is equivalent to the word of God for both are equivalent to the testimony of God.

(5) Here the first reference to raising must concern the Incarnation rather than the Resurrection.

(6) Cf. Ac.3.22,26; Dt.18.15,18; Jud.3.9 where ἐγείρειν is used. See also Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 114 on 3.26 and p. 143 on 5.30.

regarded as authoritative, inspired teachers rather than simply people with a special experience,⁽¹⁾ for the Fourth Gospel makes it clear that the testimony of the Holy Spirit is a teaching, a reminding of the doctrine of Jesus (Jn.15.26f; cf.14.26). Jesus imparts the Spirit to the disciples that they may be able to do his work, i.e. the teaching or preaching of the Gospel; the διακονία of the word (Ac.6.4) is the testifying of the Gospel (Ac.20.24).

Διαμαρτύρεσθαι is combined with λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον for the preaching of Peter and John in Ac. 8.25 which is opposed to the teaching of Simon Magus who is not true to the testimony.⁽²⁾

In 10.39 Peter claims that he and his companions from Joppa are witnesses of all that Jesus did in his lifetime and that after God had raised Jesus on the third day the latter was shown to him and the other apostles, witnesses chosen in advance by God,⁽³⁾ who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead.⁽⁴⁾ And he, Jesus, commanded them to herald to the people and to testify (διαμαρτύρασθαι) that Jesus is the one raised by God from the dead to be the judge of the quick and the dead.⁽⁵⁾

(1) Cf. Asting (*Die Verkündigung*, p. 614): "Wenn Gott für einen Menschen Zeugnis ablegt so bedeutet das, dass Gott anerkennt, dass der Wille des Betreffenden in Übereinstimmung mit seinem Willen ist. Damit wird der Betreffende als ein besonderes Werkzeug Gottes bezeichnet."

(2) Note the similarity of vv.21,23 to Dt. 29.17: μή τίς ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀνὴρ . . . , τίνας ἢ διάνοια ἐξέκλινεν ἀπὸ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν πορεύεσθαι, λατρεύειν τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκείνων; μή τίς ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν εἷσα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ; and also to Ps.77.37: ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν οὐκ εὐθέϊα μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ ἐπιστάθωσαν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ αὐτοῦ and v.56: καὶ παρεπύκρναν τὸν θεὸν τὸν ὑψιστον καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐφυλάξαντο.

(3) Cf. Ex.4.12f. where Moses, having been told that he will be instructed by God how to speak to his people, says: προχίρεισαι δυνάμενον ἄλλον, ὃν ἀποστελεῖς (fut. tense).

(4) Cf. Ex.24.11: καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἰς· καὶ ὠφθῆσαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον.

(5) Cf. I Thess.4.6. It is difficult, in the light of v.42, to

The disciples or apostles of Jesus are not, however the only witnesses in this respect. The fact that Peter goes on to say:
 τούτῳ πάντες οἱ προφῆται μαρτυροῦσιν
 allows the conclusion that the prophetic and the apostolic testimony are one and the same, viz. the revelation of God's word, the torah or testimony, the covenant, old and new, which God had made with his people.

Paul, after announcing the Resurrection of Jesus, says that his Galilean disciples are now (!)⁽¹⁾
 μαρτυρεῖς αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν (13.31). The prominent καὶ ἡμεῖς links Paul and Barnabas to the Galileans, the former being also messengers of the glad news that God's promise to the fathers has been fulfilled in Jesus⁽²⁾ but the former are apostles to the Gentiles while Peter and the others have been sent to the Jews.

understand Asting's certainty that the eye-witness view-point is in the foreground in 10.41 (Die Verkündigung, p. 606).
 (1) B E and a large number of mss. omit $\nu\sigma\nu$; D has ἀρχαὶ $\nu\sigma\nu$ εἰσιν; p⁴⁵, p⁷ and A have $\nu\sigma\nu$ εἰσιν (D has εἰς $\nu\sigma\nu$).
 (2) Strathmann (KWB, IV, 497. 5ff.) calls them 'the older apostles', assuming that Paul is referring only to the Twelve but this assumption is vitiated by Lk. 24.33. S. sees a differentiating between Paul, and Barnabas and the other apostles indicated in the use of εὐαγγελίζεσθαι in 13.32 rather than one of the μαρτυροῦντες-group but Luke does use words of this group for Paul's missionary work, e.g. 18.5; 20.21, 23f., 26; 22.15, 18; 23.11; 26.16, 22; 28.23. Also, Strathmann's attempt (op. cit. pp. 497.38 - 498.5) to distinguish between the testimony of Paul and that of 'the older apostles' by distinguishing μου μαρτυρεῖς (Ac.1.8) and οὐ μαρτυρεῖς (Ac.2.32) from μαρτυροῦντες αὐτῷ (Ac.22.15) breaks down in view of Ac.22.20: Στεφάνου τοῦ μαρτυροῦντος σου, which, according to Strathmann's reasoning would put Stephen alongside 'the older apostles' over against Paul; and this would be true also of Antipas (Rev.2.13) and the witnesses of Rev.17.6. Cf. Barth (Der Augenzeuge, p. 357, note 368):
 "Der Ausdruck μαρτυροῦντες αὐτῷ dürfte durch H. Strathmann überinterpretiert worden sein."

Paul

One of the group of prophets and teachers⁽¹⁾ at Antioch was Paul who, with Barnabas, was separated by the Holy Spirit for the ἔργον (cf. Mt.9.37f.) and sent forth by the same agency (13.2,4). They preached the word (κατήγγελλον τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ (13.5) which is also called ἡ διδασχὴ τοῦ Κυρίου (13.12) and ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας.⁽²⁾

In the second account of Paul's conversion in Ac.22 Ananias is told that Paul will be a μαρτυς for or to Christ (αὐτῷ) to all men (22.15). He has been pre-selected (like Peter and the others Ac.10.41) as a witness to know God's will, to see the Just One and to hear the voice of his mouth (i.e. his message)⁽³⁾ because he will be a witness to Jesus of the things he has seen and heard. After this Christ appears in a vision to Paul to tell him that the people in Jerusalem will not receive his μαρτυρία (22.18) and two nights later the Lord appears to him again to say: ὡς γὰρ διεμαρτύρω τὰ περὶ ἑμοῦ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, οὕτω σε δεῖ καὶ εἰς Ῥώμην μαρτυρεῖν (23.11). Chapter 9 makes it clear that the function of the witness, for which Paul, like Jeremiah,⁽⁴⁾ has been chosen in advance, separated and sent forth, is to bear Christ's name (9.15),

(1) Rengstorff (KWB. II, 160.27ff.) denies that the prophets and teachers can be identified (although it is a fact that Paul can describe himself as a herald, apostle and teacher in I Tim.2.7 and II Tim.1.11 and it is clear from Ro.12.6 and I Cor.14.6 that he regarded himself as a prophet) and concludes that as the prophets are pneumatics "so kann es sich in den διδασκαλος nur um Männer handeln, die die Gemeinde 'unpneumatisch' also aus klarer, selbständiger Einsicht heraus bauen." Cf. Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity, p.421.

(2) Cf. Ps.106.20: ἀπέστειλεν τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰάσατο αὐτούς.

(3) Cf. Ac.13.27.

(4) 1.5,7.

i.e. to preach Christ (9.20) and that in order to bear this testimony he must hear the voice of Christ's mouth (22.14), receive the Holy Spirit (9.17), i.e. the message. In the third account, in chapter 26, Jesus informs Paul that he has appeared to him *περοχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδες με ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι* (v.16) Paul is thus given exactly the same status as the *αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρεταὶ τοῦ λόγου* (of Lk.1.2.) Although he was not a companion and disciple of Jesus during his earthly ministry nevertheless he can be a witness whose task it is to open men's eyes, to turn them from darkness to light (i.e. to God's testimony) and from the power of Satan to God (26.18). This makes sense if the *μάρτυς* is not simply a witness of observable phenomena but is rather a bearer of the testimony of God as it is in Jesus Christ.⁽¹⁾ This view is reinforced by 26.19f. where Paul's obedience to the vision is seen in his showing the people that they should repent and turn to God and do works meet for repentance, by 26.22 where Paul claims to have continued to testify (*μαρτυρούμενος*), saying the same as Moses and the prophets⁽²⁾ and by Paul's own description of himself in I Cor.4.1 as *ὑπηρέτης Χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκονόμος μυστηρίων Θεοῦ*.

Cullmann⁽³⁾ sees as the first difference between the paradosis of Christ and the rabbinic principle of tradition that

(1) Possibly it is better to take *κέντρα* (Ac.26.14) in the sense employed in Sap.16.11f. where the author, speaking of the incident of the fiery serpents in the desert says: *εἰς γὰρ ὑπόμνησιν τῶν λογίων σου ἐνεκέντριζοντο...* καὶ γὰρ οὔτε βοτάνη οὔτε μάλαγμα ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς, ἀλλὰ ὁ σὸς, κύριε, λόγος ὁ πάντας ἰώμενος Cf. Sir.12.11 where *κατανύσσειν* (= prick or pierce) is used in the same sense of acknowledging God's previous words of wisdom.

(2) Cf. Justin Martyr: *Dial.* 89: *παθητὸν μὲν τὸν Χριστὸν ὅτι αἱ γραφαὶ κηρύσσουσι, φανερόν ἐστιν* (*Iustini Opera*, ed. Io. Car. Th. Eques de Otto, (1877) Vol. I. Part II, p. 326)

(3) *The Tradition in the Early Church*, p. 72.

"the mediator of the tradition is not the teacher, the rabbi, but the apostle as direct witness." But what is meant by the last phrase? C. defines the apostle as witness as one standing "in direct relation with the Lord.....he has received a direct apokalypsis" which "concerns not only the theological understanding of the history of salvation, but also the facts of this history in themselves.....he is a direct witness of the facts and their meaning." Again, "The Church also bears witness to Christ....but its witness is a derived witness, because it does not rest on the direct revelation which was the privilege of the apostle alone as an eye-witness."⁽¹⁾ C.'s distinction between the 'apostle' in the wider sense meaning 'simply an eye-witness of the resurrection of Christ' and in the narrower sense meaning 'a member of the group of the twelve who must bear witness not only to Christ risen but also to Christ incarnate upon earth' is to be faulted in respect of the phrase 'direct witness', when this is applied to one the content of whose testimony is the meaning of facts; and secondly in respect of the term 'eye-witness' which cannot really be applied to others as it is to the Twelve and their Galilean brethren and also because the second sense would exclude Paul who claims to have been not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles, being οὐκ ὀπίσθῃς τοῖς ὑποστόμοις (II Cor.11.5f.). Paul stands in as direct a relation to Jesus as Lord as the Galileans did after the Resurrection and it is clear from the record that all they were possessed of before this was the facts of Jesus' life and the words of his doctrine which they did not understand (Mt.15.16f; 16.9,11; Mk.8.17-21; 9.32; Jn.8.27; 12.16). Apart from the apparently ephemeral flash of insight on Peter's part at

(1) Ib.p.78.

Caesarea Philippi, the significance, the "apokalypsis," came to them after the Resurrection and especially during the forty days before the Ascension (Ac.1.1-8). There is only one kind of apostle and that is the man who has been apprehended by Christ and sent by him to bear his testimony. Cullmann is correct when he says: ⁽¹⁾ "the Kyrios Christ is present in the tradition of the apostles, and therefore also in the tradition as fixed in the written documents.....The Holy Spirit confronts the believing reader directly with Christ." - just as he confronted those who heard the oral tradition or kerygma (Ac.2.37) testified (!) by Peter (2.40).

Cullmann's claim that the NT apostles stood in a direct relation with the Lord is true enough; it is also true that the disciples stood in a direct relation with Jesus but no present-day believer should admit that these people were in any more direct relation with the Lord than he himself is. What is admissible is that they were in a more direct relation with Jesus of Nazareth who becomes known as the Lord in a direct way to every believer. If Christian faith means hearing and admitting the claim of Jesus of Nazareth to be the fulfilment of the OT testimony then the knowledge of this testimony and the knowledge of Jesus' life and teaching are necessary presuppositions of that faith and the testimony of the eye-witnesses is important, in fact essential, otherwise there can be no revelation. It is difficult, however, to see how there can be one revelation of the risen Lord which is more direct than another. The eye- and ear-witnesses saw and heard the facts of Jesus' life and death and resurrection and received by faith Jesus' interpretation of

(1) Ib.p.81.

these facts. Later generations also see and hear these facts and Jesus' interpretation in the testimony or kerygma of the Christian preacher. All generations of Christians from the disciples to the present day are in the same relation to Jesus as Christ.

There are four other places where Luke uses διαμαρτύρεσθαι for Paul's testifying. In chapter 18 there is an account of Paul preaching to the Corinthians: συνέχετο τῷ λόγῳ ὁ Παῦλος, διαμαρτυρόμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν (v.5) which has an affinity with Paul's own reference to the testimony of Christ (I Cor.1.6) and the testimony of God (I Cor.2.1). This incident is reminiscent also of Ezek.33 where the prophet is to speak God's word of warning and mercy and repentance if he is to be clean from the blood of the people.

In Ac.18,20 and 23 there are parallels to other prophecies of Ezekiel which show that μαρτύρεσθαι and διαμαρτύρεσθαι⁽¹⁾ are closely associated in Paul's mind with the prophetic word: (a) In Ezek.2.1-5 the prophet is given his commission to preach to Israel (cf.Ac.22.15); (b) in 2.6 he is told not to fear (cf. Ac.18.9); (c) in 3.17f. he is made a watchman (σκοπός) of the house of Israel to warn the wicked and turn him from his ways (cf.Ac.20.20f.); (d) otherwise their blood will be required at the prophet's hand (3.20) (cf.Ac.20.26f.); (e) in 3.24f. the Spirit foretells that bonds are prepared for Ezekiel (cf.Ac. 20.23); (f) he is to prophesy upon Jerusalem (4.7f; cf.16.1f; 20.4 where διαμαρτύρεσθαι is used) (cf.Ac.23.18); (g) 5.1-4

(1) Black (The Scrolls and Christian Origins, p.120) notes that "In the Habbakuk Commentary the Teacher of Righteousness is a new Ezekiel, a prophet-priest who reveals all the words of his servants the prophets (1.5)."

contains instructions for the shaving of his head and beard (cf. Ac. 18.18f.); (h) 13.1-16 is a doom against the false prophets who are plastering a wall along with which they will be destroyed (cf. Ac. 23.3 where Paul says to the high priest: God shall smite thee, whited wall. Here Ananias and the elders are reckoned to be the false prophets who have seen a false vision; they are the false witnesses who oppose the true and faithful witnesses, Jesus, Paul, Stephen, Antipas and the others.) (i) Ezek. 34.23 contains God's promise that he will raise up his servant David to be the shepherd of his people, a promise to which Paul refers in Ac. 26.6-8. Paul's commission is, of course, different from that of Ezekiel, but only in respect of his knowledge of the fulfilment of the testimony of God in Jesus (Ac. 20.21,24f.).

In Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders he reminds them of his teaching: διαμαρτυρόμενος Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ (1)
 "Ἐλλήσιν τὴν εἰς Θεὸν μετάνοιαν καὶ πίστιν (1)
 εἰς τὸν (2) Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν (20.21) and of the
 ministry (2) which he had received from the Lord Jesus
 διαμαρτύρασθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ (20.24).

Luke breaks off his story of Paul's mission with the picture of the apostle preaching the kingdom of God and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus, earlier described

(1) Cf. Jesus' own testifying: "Repent and believe" (Mk. 1.15).

(2) Cf. ὑπηρέτην (26.16) and δούλεύων (20.19).

αὐτὸν διαμαρτυρούμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ,
 πείθων τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
 ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν
 προφητῶν (28.23).

Stephen

The fact should never be lost sight of that, according to
 Luke, ⁽¹⁾ Paul calls Stephen "Jesus' μάρτυς" (22.20). ⁽²⁾ In

(1) Mundle (ZNW.20(1921), p. 145) claims that Stephen's speech is entirely Luke's work on the grounds that no Jew could deliver such a polemic against Judaism and that not even Paul did so. Against this it has to be said that the early Christians were more concerned to uphold the testimony of the scriptures than they were to foster the traditions of men; also Paul could say strong things against Judaism (Ro.2.23f; 3.10-19; 10.3,21) and the author of Hebrews makes out a strong and clear case for the abolition of the Jewish cultus.

(2) Kattenbusch (ZNW.4(1903), p. 115) avers that Paul must have called Stephen μάρτυς because he had seen a vision of Christ, but this is quite out of line with the Biblical use of the word-group. K. is followed by Holl who (Die Vorstellung vom Märtyrer, p.71) argues weakly that because the meanings of μάρτυς in vv.15 and 20 lie close together that therefore the martyr is one who is a witness of (that is, one who has seen) the resurrection and, disregarding Stephen's prophetic testimony in Ac.6 and 7, maintains that he is a witness because of his having had a vision of the risen Christ (7.55f.) Cf. Lake and Cadbury (Beginnings, Pt.I. Vol. IV.p. 281): "This passage is obviously a step towards the use of μάρτυς in the sense of martyr; "
Morgenthaler, Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, p.26; Bruce (The Acts of the Apostles, p. 405). "This use of the word is a step in the direction of the later meaning 'martyr' (cf. Rev.11.13)"; Haenchen: Apostelgeschichte, p. 112, note 5 and p. 557 with note 2; Beyer, Apostelgeschichte, p. 136 and Menoud, Jésus et ses Témoins, pp. 14f. This view was opposed by Schlatter (Der Märtyrer, p. 296, note 50): "Weil er (Stephen) ein Zeuge Jesu war, wurde sein Blut verschüttet"; Asting (Die Verkündigung, p. 602) sees Stephen's μαρτυρία as being, not martyrdom but representing Christ before the authorities. Günther (Μάρτυς, p. 108), to support his view that Stephen is not a μάρτυς in the sense of martyr, asks the very pertinent question. "Why did Ignatius of all people not use μάρτυς? for his need of such a word is obvious"; Strathmann (KWB.IV,498 17-19); "Stephanus heisst nicht μάρτυς weil er stirbt, sondern

view of the proximity of μαρτυρεῖν in 22.18⁽¹⁾ and the close similarity of Ac.26.22 and 7.52 it is difficult to see how Luke could have used μάρος in a different sense for Paul (and the Twelve) on the one hand and Stephen on the other⁽²⁾ and this is borne out by the evidence of cc.6 and 7. In the first place, Stephen was one of the μαρτυρούμενοι (Ac.6.3)⁽³⁾; secondly, he was a man 'full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom (6.3,5,10) full of grace (p^{te} ABD) and power (6.8)⁽⁴⁾

er stirbt weil er Christi Zeuge ist, und zwar durch seine evangelistische Tätigkeit."

(1) Cf. Gass, ZHT, (1859), III, p. 326. It is significant that Luke uses παραδέχεσθαι (the technical term for the receiving of tradition) for the receiving of Paul's μαρτυρία.

(2) Cf. Strathmann, KWB, IV, 498 and von Campenhausen who (Stud. Theol. (1947/48), pp. 117f.) sees this as due to a progressive narrowing of the content of the testimony in Luke so that finally the Twelve alone are called witnesses of the resurrection and so 'witness of the resurrection' means simply 'missionary'.

(3) See above p. 11 note 11.

(4) Cf. Greeven (ZNW, 44 (1952/3), p. 24, note 54): "Der christlicher 'Lehrer' zieht den jüdischen Gezeitzeslehrern den Boden unter den Füßen weg, indem er ihre eigene Überlieferung gegen sie kehrt." Cerfaux (Recueil, II, p. 173) writes: "Essentiellement, le témoignage d'Etienne reste donc dans la ligne du témoignage des Apôtres; il est, comme le leur, messianique, juridique et religieux. La seule différence est que tous ces derniers traits, pour Etienne, sont accentués au détriment de l'objet premier du témoignage, la résurrection du Christ." But Ac.6.14 does not make sense unless Stephen was preaching the resurrection; and, also, 7.37 is to be considered for although in Deut.18.15 ἀναστήσει has no reference to resurrection in the Christian sense there can be no doubt that in the mind of Stephen and his contemporaries the incarnation and the resurrection of Jesus were inseparable. Lake and Cadbury (Beginnings, Pt. I, Vol. IV, p. 65) note the similarity of this passage with the LXX account of the choosing of Joshua in Num.27.16-18.

which are the marks of the prophet⁽¹⁾ or testimony-bearer. Thirdly, Stephen's speech before his judges is an attempt to show them how Israel has always rejected God's testimony and how the successor foretold by Moses is Jesus whom they have rejected. Moses received the living oracles,⁽²⁾ i.e. the testimony which was kept in the tabernacle (7.44). Stephen sets the tabernacle of testimony in contrast to the οἶκος of Solomon⁽³⁾ not, as Reicke has it⁽⁴⁾ as "ein Bild der Kirche" because "ein Zelt des 'Zeugnisses', des Märtyriums, sollte die christliche Kirche eben sein," but to show that the testimony is more important than the temple and its sacrifices (cf. Jn. 4.20-26). Solomon built a temple when he ought to have known better (7.47-49).⁽⁵⁾ The Jews have always resisted the Holy Spirit⁽⁶⁾ and persecuted the prophets who foretold the coming

(1) For Stephen as prophet see Lods (Confesseurs et Martyrs, pp. 10f.). L., however, tries to make out that the prophets are charismatics in the ecstatic sense.

(2) Cf. Ps. 118:11, 14, 17, 25, 50 and 144 where these oracles or testimonies are said to give life to the one who keeps them. In Ac. 6.15 the face of Stephen the μάρτυς who loves and keeps the testimonies is said to have been like the face of an angel when he testified before the leaders of the people and there is a resemblance here to Ps. 118.135: τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπέφανον ἐπὶ τὸν δούλον σου.

(3) Cf. Mundle, ZNW.20(1921), p. 144. Ropes' contention (Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 102(1930), p. 308) that there is no occasion for thinking that Stephen approached to the Pauline teaching of the now-superseded validity of the law is over-ruled by Ac. 6.13f. These verses R. interprets as an eschatological forecast - an interpretation which was not entertained by Stephen's accusers!

(4) Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, p. 154.

(5) Cf. Reicke, op. cit., p. 155. Jesus made this same point to the Samaritan woman (Jn. 4.21-24).

(6) Cf. Num. 27.14 and Jer. 6.10: πρὸς τίνα λαλήσω καὶ διαμαρτύεσθαι, καὶ ἀκούσεται;

of the Just One whom Stephen's hearers have murdered. They received the law and did not guard it. Stephen's end is reminiscent of a speech of Mattathias in which he tells his followers to be valiant for the law for by it they shall obtain glory (I Macc.2.64; cf. Ac.6.15; 7.55) and all Israel made great lamentation for him (I Macc.2.70; cf. Ac.8.2). Stephen the $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ is thus seen to be the upholder of the $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$ the torah of God, fulfilled in Jesus, the Just One.⁽¹⁾ It may be that the author of Acts is concerned to portray the trial of a martyr⁽²⁾ but it seems more likely that he wishes to show one

(1) Corssen (Begriff und Wesen des Märtyrers in der Alten Kirche, p. 483) neatly describes the connection between Stephen's speech and his vision: "Er das, was er 'in abstracto' demonstriert hatte, 'in concreto' schaut." Rengstorff (Die Auferstehung Jesu, p.140) expands this: "Er (Stephen) erweist sich als ein echter $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ (vgl. Apg.22.20), aber nicht etwa deshalb, weil ihm - so hat man es ansehen zu sollen gemeint - 'in der entscheidenden Stunde die Gabe verliehen wurde, die überirdische Welt und den Herrn, zu dem er sich bekannte, mit Augen zu sehen', sondern durch die Art und Weise, wie er die $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\alpha$, nämlich den Pentateuch und die Propheten, deutet und für die Gemeinde Jesu zur Begründung und Rechtfertigung ihres Glaubens in Anspruch nimmt (Apg.7.2ff.)". and describes the $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ in Acts as a Scripture expositor and interpreter, quoting 2.23ff; 3.18; 10.43; 13.27ff; 26.22 and also I Cor.15.15: "Er (Paul) nimmt in seiner $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha$ Gottes prophetisches Wort auf, sofern es sich in der Geschichte Jesu und zumal in deren Ausgang erfüllt hat (Apg. 1.16; vgl. 4.33 neben 4.23ff.)." (op.cit. pp. 142f.). Surkau (Martyrien, p.109) states correctly: "Die Stephanus-Rede gehört nicht zum Martyrium. Sie weist nicht die typischen Merkmale einer Märtyrer-Rede auf....Sie ist Verkündigung....Die Verse (55-57) liegen ganz in der Linie von Act.1,33.36; 3,11ff; 10,42; 17,31."

(2) Cf. Rétif (Témoignage et Prédication, p.155, note (11)): "Il est plus simple et plus obvie de voir ici une référence au témoignage rendu par Etienne au Christ, aussi bien avant son attestation, VI,8,10, qu'après, ibid.,7; cfr. Luc.XXI,12-15, en un mot de toute son activité kérygmatische."

of the first witnesses bearing testimony. In Ac. 6 and 7 is presented a picture of a Jerusalem witness, a disciple of the Twelve, in action.⁽¹⁾

The testimony of the disciples is based on the testimony of God which is mentioned in 13.22: ἤγειρεν (ὁ Θεός) τὸν Δαυεὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα, ᾧ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας, Εὐερον κ.τ.λ.; in 15.8 Paul, speaking about his mission to the Gentiles, says that Θεός ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς δοὺς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν⁽²⁾ which is another way of saying that the Gentiles heard the word of the Gospel and believed (15.7). In 14.3 Luke has already given an example of this very thing: In Iconium Paul and Barnabas spoke the word so convincingly that a great multitude believed (14.1), and then comes the Godward expression of this: They speak boldly ἐπὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ τῷ μαρτυροῦντι ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ.⁽³⁾ The Holy Spirit is the witness in 20.23, a verse which recalls Ezek.3.24-27 where it is revealed to the prophet by the Spirit that bonds are prepared for him and that the Spirit will give him the words of his message.

(1) Cf. Gass (ZHT.3(1859), p.326): "Stephanus als erster Anführer auf dem apostolischen Leidenswege wird mit Feierlichkeit auf den Schauplatz gestellt; seine unerschrockene Strafrede an die Juden und sein letzter den Mördern vergleichender Aufblick zum Menschensohn (7.56) stellen das Bild eines treuen Jüngers in der Nachfolge des Todes vor Augen. Derselbe Stephanus heisst in der Rede des Paulus ὁ μάρτυς σου (scil. τοῦ Χριστοῦ), und nach dem kurz vorangegangenen μαρτυρία kann dieser Name nur den Zeugen d.h. Bezeuger oder Vertreter, noch nicht gerade den Blutzeugen im späteren Sinne bedeuten (Apgsch.22.20)."

(2) Cf. 14.3; 14.17; 15.8; 20.23: NB. the last phrase goes with both verbs.

(3) Cf. Dt.6.20-22: καὶ ἔσται ὅταν ἐρωτήσῃ σε ὁ υἱός σου, ἀρεῖον λέγων τί ἔστιν τὰ μαρτυρία καὶ ἐρεῖς ... ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς κύριος ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἔδωκεν κύριος σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα . Cf. Mk.16.20; Heb.2.4.

In 14.17 Paul states of God: καίτοι οὐκ ἁμάρτερον αὐτὸν ἀφῆκεν ἀγαθοεργῶν, that is, without someone or something to pass on to the world the knowledge of God and his ways or laws (in contrast to the ways of the nations (14.16). Here again there is an emphasis upon the teaching function of the witness who reminds his hearers of what God has said and done.

In Acts as in the Gospels the testimony has many synonyms to shed light on its character. There can be no doubt that in the mind of the early Church the testimony was of the same pattern as the OT torah, Jesus being regarded as the fulfilment. The testimony is what Jesus did and taught⁽¹⁾ as is seen by comparing Ac. 20.24,25. Being a witness is a διακονία (1.17,25), an ἐπισκοπή (1.20) and an ἀποστολή (1.25). In the first instance of the Apostles' bearing witness they are said λαλεῖν ἑτέροις γλώσσαις καθὼς τὸ Πνεῦμα ἑδίδου ἀποφθέγγεσθαι αὐτοῖς.⁽²⁾ (2.4). It is interesting that Caleb who testified before the congregation (I Macc.2.56), that is, was zealous for God, is described in Nu.14.24 as God's παῖς having another spirit within him (πνεῦμα ἕτερον ἐν αὐτῷ). And Moses' Song, called a μαρτύριον (Dt.31.19),

(1) Cf. v. Campenhausen (Stud. Theol. (1947/48), p. 121): "Als μαρτύριον hat die διδασχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων einen grundlegenden historischen Gehalt: sie enthält den Bericht der Augenzeugen über das Leben und Wirken Jesu und vor allem das Zeugnis von der Auferstehung, in dem sich alles zusammenfasst und für den Glauben oder Unglauben zur Entscheidung kommt. In diesem Sinne war es auch für Paulus gleichbedeutend mit 'dem Evangelium' gewesen" but also it is 'selbst eine heilsgeschichtliche Wirklichkeit, durch die Christus in der Zeit vergegenwärtigt wird, aktualisiertes Zeugnis, das als Anrede gehört werden soll und in der Anwendung auf die gegenwärtige Situation der Hörer als Bussruf, Verheissung und Gebot zum Ereignis wird."

(2) Kohler (The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church, p. 234): "The event of Pentecost was fashioned after the Jewish Pentecost which was taken by the Rabbis to have been the day of the divine revelation on Sinai at which the Ten Commandments were given forth

styles itself: τὸ ἀπόφθεγμα (Dt.32.2) which is the gift of the Holy Spirit to the disciples at Pentecost.⁽¹⁾ Peter explains that this is the prophesying foretold by Joel⁽²⁾ so testimony and prophecy are the same thing (cf. Rev.19.10). Testimony is also παρ' ἐκλήσεως (2.40) of the Holy Spirit (9.31) and διδαχὴ⁽³⁾ (2.42; 4.2; 5.21 etc.); the words of life (5.20); βουλὴ καὶ ἔλεος (5.38); the word of his grace (14.3; 20.32); the διακονία τοῦ λόγου⁽⁴⁾ (6.4); the way of

in seventy tongues of fire to reach the seventy nations of the earth."

(1) Cf. Ps.80.6: μαρτύριον ἐν τῷ Ιωσηφ ἔθετο αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἐξελεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου· γλῶσσαν, ἣν οὐκ ἔγνω, ἤκουσεν.

(2) He might have added Zephaniah for here too there is an obvious influence (3.8f.): διὰ τοῦτο ὑπόμενόν με, λέγει κύριος, εἰς ἡμέραν ἀνάστασώς μου εἰς μαρτύριον· διότι τὸ κρίμα μου εἰς συναγωγὰς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἰσδέξασθαι βασιλεῖς τοῦ ἐκχέαι ἐπ' αὐτοὺς πᾶσαν ὀργὴν θυμοῦ μου· διότι ἐν πνεὶ ζήλους μου καταναλωθήσεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ· ὅτι τότε μεταστρέψω ἐπὶ λαοὺς γλῶσσαν εἰς γενεὰν αὐτῆς τοῦ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι πάντας τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τοῦ δουλεύειν αὐτῷ ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἑνα.

(3) Rengstorff (KWB.II. pp. 147f.) distinguishes incorrectly the διδάσκειν of the Urgemeinde as "die unbewusste Weitergabe und Sichtung der Wortüberlieferung" and the kerygma in which "die Sammlung des Erzählungsstoffes einsetzt" both being contained in the original Christian message: "Repent and believe in the Gospel" (Mk.1.15). R. notices that διδάσκειν is used by Paul in Ro. 2.21 (op.cit., p. 148. 22ff.) in the sense of 'to give instruction in the law' but fails to point out that in the same verse κηρύσσειν is used in exactly the same sense! Also (p.149.4-10) he sees the difficulty presented by Ac.18.11 and seeks to remove it by declining to take λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ as NT salvation-proclamation in the absolute sense but as salvation-proclamation on the basis of scripture and from Scripture.

(4) Cf. 20.19, δουλεύων = testifying (v.21).

salvation (16.17). For 'testifying' Luke uses: καταγγέλλειν ⁽¹⁾ (4.2, 13.5 etc.), μαθητεύειν (14.21), παρεσιάζεσθαι (4.13; cf. v.31; 9.27f. etc.); εὐαγγελίζεσθαι (5.42 etc.) ⁽²⁾; κηρύσσειν (8.5; 9.20 etc.); διαλέγεσθαι ⁽³⁾ ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν, διανοίγων καὶ παρατιθέμενος (17.2f.); κατηχεῖν (18.25); τὸ ἔργον (13.2); ἀναγγέλλειν (20.20). This selection shows the wide and rich variety of the terms used by Luke to describe the preaching and teaching of the early witnesses and it is very difficult to believe that the writer always had in mind a precise nuance when he used an expression and that he did not use this wide range in the interests of style.

-
- (1) Schniewind (KWB.I, 70f.) denies that καταγγέλλειν in Ac.4.2; 17.3; 13.38; 10.43 and 17.23 is equivalent to 'instruct' but is simply 'Ausrufen', 'Predigen' but he admits that παράδοσις (I Cor.11.23) includes νουθετεῖν and διδάσκειν.
- (2) Friedrich (KWB.VI, 856f.) distinguishes between εὐαγγέλιον and προφητεία because the former is addressed to non-Christians and the latter to believers but admits (856.28-36) that a fast distinction cannot be maintained. He says: "Das προφητεύειν am Pfingsttage (Ag.2,17f.) ist ein διαμαρτύρεσθαι und παρακαλεῖν".
- Schweizer (Church Order, 5h) says: "For Luke, the apostle is neither the eschatological ruler in the coming kingdom, nor the person called by the risen Lord to be a messenger. He is the eye-witness of Jesus' life and work and only as such is he called on to witness (Acts.1.21f.)" and denies "that for Luke Ac.1.21f. and 9.1ff. were on the same plane". But it would seem (a) that to be a messenger and to be called to witness are one and the same and (b) that Jesus' appearing to the apostles is called ὁπτανόμενος (Ac.1.3) and in Ac.26.19 Paul refers to his vision as ὁπτασία.
- (3) Παρατίθεσθαι is used for Moses instructing the elders in Ex.19.7; cf. Lk.12.48.

The Content of the Testimony

The Jerusalem Apostles

When the subject-matter of the testimony is examined it is seen to fall into the same four groups as have already been noted. In the preaching of the Jerusalem church in the first days (a) the sovereignty of the Lord Jesus is testified in 2.33-36; God has made Jesus both Lord and Christ, and also in 3.13,15; 4.11; 5.31 and 10.36. (b) The moral law is referred to indirectly in the call to repentance (2.38; 3.19,26; 5.31) and the doer of righteousness is said to be accepted by God (10.35). (c) Redemption is seen as the remission of sins (2.38; 5.31; 10.43) by the suffering of Christ (3.18). Salvation is in the name of Jesus (4.12) who is the word sent by God (10.36; cf. Ps. 106.20). (d) The promise of God is mentioned explicitly in 2.39; times of refreshing shall come from the Lord who shall send Jesus (3.20); there is a reference in 10.42 to the last judgement when Jesus will be judge of living and dead.

Stephen

Surkau⁽¹⁾ limits the testimony of Stephen to "Gottes Gericht" but the content includes reference (a) to the God of glory (7.2; cf. Ps.28.3), whose throne is heaven and whose footstool is earth, the creator of all (7.49f.) and Jesus is at his right hand (7.55). (b) He is the Holy One (7.33) who gives the living *λογία* (7.38) and who sets his face against the impurities of the idols and their worshippers (7.39-43). (c) His redemptive action is seen in the events of the Exodus (7.7,25,34,36) and Jesus has now replaced Moses as the deliverer (7.37). (d) The promise of God is mentioned in his promise to give the land to Abraham (7.5).

(1) Martyrien, p. 109.

Philip

Philip the evangelist is included among the μαρτυροῦμενοι (6.3, 21.8) and therefore may be regarded as a witness;⁽¹⁾ he is a herald of Christ (8.5) and an evangelist of the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ (8.12), that is, he announces the gospel which is Jesus (8.35). The content of Philip's testimony concerns (a) the kingdom of God (8.12) which is seen in Jesus who was foretold in Isaiah as being the arm of the Lord (53.2); (b) men have wandered from his ways (53.6); (c) he bears our sins (53.4) and was wounded because of our sin (53.5) and the Lord has laid our sins on him (53.6). (d) There is also the promise that he will inherit many and divide the spoils of the mighty (53.12); his seed shall inherit the Gentiles and he shall make the desolate cities to be inhabited (54.3).⁽²⁾

Paul

The testimony which is committed to Paul by the risen Christ is the same as all the foregoing⁽³⁾: (a) Jesus is Christ, the Son of God (9.20), the Lord (26.15); (b) 23.1 shows the necessity of having a good conscience; Paul speaks to Felix of righteousness and temperance (24.25; cf. 26.18 and 26.20) where Paul's preaching is the same as that of John the Baptist (Mt. 3.8). (c) Redemption is in terms of forgiveness and deliverance from the power of Satan (26.18) which is effected through the suffering of Christ (26.23). (d) The promise lies in the hope of the resurrection of the dead (23.6; 25.19; 26.8, 23), the inheritance among the saints (26.18) promised to the

(1) See above p.11 note 11.

(2) Note the appropriateness of the prophecy concerning eunuchs which follows in Is.56.3-8.

(3) Note the similarity to Dt.4, especially vv.12,36,45 and Ps. 118.46.

fathers (26.6). In Paul's sermon at Antioch in Pisidia (a) he quotes John the Baptist's confession that he is not worthy to loose Jesus' sandals (13.25); (b) the reference to John's baptism of repentance introduces the idea of the moral law (13.24); (c) God's salvation is seen in the mention of the Exodus and God's subsequent care for the people (13.17-22), the raising of the Saviour Jesus (13.23), the word of salvation (13.26), forgiveness and justification (13.38f.); (d) The promise of God has been fulfilled (13.32f.), future judgment is hinted at in 13.40f. and in 13.48 there is mention of those who are ordained to eternal life.

In Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders the fourfold nature of the testimony can be seen for the apostle preaches (a) the kingdom of God (20.25), (b) repentance towards God (20.21) and good works (20.35), (c) he preaches the gospel of the grace of God (20.24) and speaks of the church being purchased by God's own blood (20.28, cf. Ps.73.2), (d) In 20.32 Paul speaks of the inheritance among all those who are sanctified which the word of God's grace is able to give his hearers.

The final chapter of Acts also contains a short account of Paul expounding and testifying, heralding and teaching in Rome. ⁽¹⁾ In this (a) he speaks of the kingdom of God (28.23, 31); (b) that Paul's preaching was concerned with the moral law may be gathered from the fact that in 28.26f. he quotes Isaiah 6.9f., a reference to the sin of the people; ⁽²⁾ (c) God's healing and salvation are part of the content of the preaching and (d) Paul has already told the Jewish leaders that it is

(1) Clearly there is no difference here between διαμαρτυρεσθαι and κηρύσσειν.
 (2) See also Is.9.5,7.

for the hope of Israel that he is in chains (28.20; cf. Col.1.27: Christ in you, the hope of glory).⁽¹⁾

The Authority of the Witnesses

The Jerusalem Apostles

The authority claimed by Peter and the other disciples is not that of eye-witnesses of historical events but is rather that of men who have seen a great truth about God shining out of these events and are concerned that others also should have this experience, that is to say it is a teaching authority.⁽²⁾

(1) Diem's dictum (Ev. Theol. 1 (1934/35), p. 426) is correct: "Das NT kennt...weder das unfehlbar Lehramt noch die unfehlbare reine Lehre" but this does not mean that the Church does not recognise as authoritative teachers those who taught the classical testimony in principle.

(2) Cf. Bultmann, Theology of the NT. I, p. 59. Beyer (KWB. II. 87.29-36) writes: "aber auch das höchste aller christlichen Ämter, die Verkündigung des Evangeliums, wird als Dienst am Wort bezeichnet: Ag.6,4." In his note 3. B. continues: "Der διακονία τοῦ λόγου entspricht formal der Dienst der Tora תורה לַיהוָה. Aber damit ist nicht die Verkündigung, sondern das Erlernen der Halacha durch den Umgang mit den Gelehrten gemeint, (Str/Bill. zu Ag. 6.4)." The fact that directly after this setting apart of the apostles to the διακονία τοῦ λόγου Stephen begins to teach and preach and the word of God increases everywhere casts suspicion on the assumption that the apostles limited the preaching to themselves; rather are they the witnesses who are the primary authorities (chronologically) for the content of the testimony of Jesus. Cf. Gerhardsson: (Memory and Manuscript, pp. 240-245. G., however, maintains the view that "the early Christian message claimed to be the eye-witness account of definite persons who were able to vouch for the "truth" of their information". This can only mean that the witnesses claimed to give a correct report of Jesus' words and actions; they could not prove the truth of his teaching any more than he himself could. The lack of strict discipline in the Church and the desire of many to be teachers caused the church at a later date to commit to writing the original apostles' μαρτυρίαν or εὐαγγέλιον.

Jesus chose apostles but so did the risen Christ (1.2,24). "He showed himself alive by many infallible proofs", it is claimed, but *παρίστημι* means 'to set before the mind',⁽¹⁾ and *τεκμήριον* means 'proof by testimony'.⁽²⁾ Peter and the Galilean disciples are described by Luke as apostles chosen by Jesus to whom he showed himself alive and gave commandments (Ac.1.2f.). On these grounds it has been claimed by some that the apostles' authority rests on a situation which cannot be repeated and therefore cannot be transferred, and by others that the authority was in actual fact handed on. The standpoint of the present thesis is that if the function of the apostle is to testify to facts and, equally importantly, to the truth borne by them he must (a) have been an ear-and-eye-witness of the facts and (b) be persuaded by the Holy Spirit of the truth they carry. The experience of the eye-witnesses of the original facts (the words and works of Jesus) cannot happen to later generations in actuality but when the former testify or call to mind these facts the second generation, confronted by the re-presentation of the facts, may also be persuaded by the Holy Spirit of the truth they carry and so, in turn, may become valid witnesses. The second generation cannot prove that the facts took place or that the interpretation of them is true, but then neither could the first generation - they could only be ...witnesses! A great deal depends on the trustworthiness of the first witnesses as to the facts, to the power of their persuasiveness, (i.e. the power of the Holy Spirit) and to the ability and willingness of the hearer to 'see' the truth (i.e. the testimony

(1) *παρίστημι* = 'to set before the mind', 'to put into the mind.' (LS.1340.A.II.1).

(2) LS.1768.II.1 give: 'proof' (properly of an argumentative kind, opp. of direct evidence. Is.4.12,8.6) and II.3, as in the Logic of Aristotle, 'demonstrative proof'.

of the Holy Spirit). Thus it is equally important to establish as firmly as is possible the historicity of the events to which the eye-witnesses testify and constantly to test the proclamation of the Church by them. The authority of Peter and the disciples of Jesus is the primary one, chronologically, but when their account of what Jesus did and taught is accepted, their authority, the authority of the truth of God enshrined in the action and teaching of Jesus is no greater than that of any other witnesses; as Paul says in Gal.2.6: "They added nothing to me."⁽¹⁾ The desire for visible, infallible proofs of God has always been strong in the human mind from Moses to Thomas and right through to the present day. Moses and Thomas learned their mistake, realising that no man can see God and live (Ex. 33.20; Jn.20.29) but nevertheless words for physical seeing are used for the awareness of God throughout the Bible.⁽²⁾

The authority of the disciples of Jesus is greater than that of other witnesses like Paul and Stephen only in respect of their eye-witness testimony to the facts about Jesus of Nazareth, facts of which other people exclusive of the twelve and the other disciples had knowledge. But testimony to bare historical facts gives, by itself, no authority, no power; there must be, at the same time, interpretation and application, that is testimony to the truth to which the facts point for those who believe, the truth that Jesus of Nazareth is the Saviour of the world. Stephen, presumably, since he was a Greek, had no eye-witness knowledge of the life of Jesus but he was admitted by Luke to be a very powerful witness (Ac.6.10). The eye-

(1) Cf. Schweitzer, Church Order, 23c.

(2) E.g. Ex.14.13: "Stand still and see the salvation of the Lord"; Ps.62.3. "that I may see thy power and thy glory"; Ps.96.6: "all the people have seen his glory"; Is.35.2: "My people shall see the glory of the Lord and the majesty of God"; cf. 40.5; 52.10; 66.18.

witness testimony of Peter and his fellows with their interpretation of it and their zeal had met faith in Stephen, that is to say, the Holy Spirit added his testimony to that of the disciples and Stephen became a believer and a witness.

Thus the concept of the Christian witness, combining as it does the two inextricably-connected strands of eye-witness testimony and testimony to the truth concealed within the events sums up the idea of revelation. It was revelation, testimony, the word, which Jesus entrusted to his disciples, his own very self as event and truth. The people in the early church who exercised authority were those who taught and preached the testimony which Jesus embodied, enacted and taught. The men of Galilee received the testimony from Jesus, by the Spirit as all God's prophets and servants before them had received it. Stephen and the disciples of the first disciples presumably received it from those last and Stephen's authority was not transmitted by the laying on of hands; like Joshua he had the Spirit before he was appointed to his office and what he obtained from the apostles was not authority but a recognition and acknowledgement of an authority which was already his.

Luke says that it was διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου that Jesus gave commandments (ἐντειλάμενος) ⁽¹⁾ to his disciples before he was taken up, ⁽²⁾ being seen by them for

(1) Ἐντολή is occasionally used for Torah in the OT e.g. Dt. 17.19; IV K.21.8; II Chron.12.1; 30.16.

(2) It is perhaps significant that Elijah's departure from earth for which the author of IV K. uses this word ἀνελήμφθη (2.11) occurred in fire and whirlwind and that at this time Elisha was to receive a double portion of his master's spirit. (cf. Jn.14.12).

forty days.⁽¹⁾ They are told to wait for the promised baptism of the Spirit (cf. Is. 42.1) and so be his witnesses (cf. 43.10), having been given the power to preach effectively.⁽²⁾ This outpouring of the Spirit is seen as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel about the salvation which will come to all who call on the name of the Lord, and about men proclaiming the gospel in Jerusalem (Joel 3.5).

Matthias takes the place of Judas, not as an authoritative eye-witness of the Resurrection and certainly not as having been one of the twelve apostles commissioned by Jesus (Mt. 10.1) - there were others who had the same qualification as Matthias (1.21) - but as an authoritative,⁽³⁾ accredited teacher of the new μαθητεῖον. Brosch⁽⁴⁾ distinguishes between the charismatic apostle and what he calls the hierarchical apostolate of the Twelve instituted by Jesus Christ, claiming that Sohm's failure to do so led to his, according to B., erroneous, view of the charismatic organisation of the early Church; this, however, cannot be sustained in view of the foregoing. There is in fact no evidence that Jesus founded a hierarchical apostolate. The authority of the disciples of Jesus derived from their knowledge of the Word yet B. avers: "Das Amt der Zwölf war von jedem anderen Apostolat dadurch verschieden, dass sie durch Jesus gesandt waren, und dass ihr Apostolat über eine rein missionarische Bedeutung hinaus auch stellvertretenden Charakter im juristische Sinne hatte.....zwischen dem Apostelkollegium mit seiner juristisch gefassten Sendung und dem rein charismatischen

(1) Cf. Ex. 24.18 where Moses was forty days and forty nights in the mountain receiving the original testimony.

(2) Cf. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 71 on 1.8.

(3) But not an official, as Günther, Μαθητεῖον, p. 104.

(4) Charismen und Ämter in der Urkirche, p. 95.

Apostolat stehen Gestalten, deren Sendung nicht so sehr offiziell als religiös verstanden sein will."⁽¹⁾ Harnack⁽²⁾ lists the authorities to which the early churches were subject but does not point out that the apostles and teachers set themselves under the Gospel (e.g. the Twelve apostles give themselves to the diakonia of the word (Ac.6.4) and they are witnesses who remind the world about the word. Lowrie, resting on Sohm's Kirchenrecht, states well: "The Church of Jesus Christ can never be a legal organisation but there is one element in it which can in some way be construed as a formal right - a right inherent in an office as such. It was altogether natural that the assembly should come to recognise certain of its members as permanently endowed with particular gifts for instruction. But fundamentally the recognition was understood to apply to their utterances."⁽³⁾

In Num.14, mentioned above, Moses says that the LORD is seen 'eyes to eyes' by Israel (14.14) and Isaiah prophesies that this will occur again (52.8) but it cannot be held that this refers simply to physical sight. In Moses' day they saw God in the pillars of cloud and fire; the disciples saw God in Jesus.

The authority of the witnesses of the resurrection is that of men who have seen the truth of God. These men were not 'beside themselves' when they prophesied, preached or taught; theirs was a truly spiritual or charismatic authority which rested on the new commandments of Jesus⁽⁴⁾ and on the gift of the Holy Spirit which enables those upon whom it is poured to

⁽¹⁾ Op. cit., p. 105.

⁽²⁾ The History of Dogma, p. 98: (a) the OT in the Christian sense; (b) the tradition of the Messianic History of Jesus; (c) the words of the Lord; (d) every writing proved to have been given by the Spirit; (e) every tested prophet and teacher; (f) the Twelve;

(g) Paul.

⁽³⁾ The Church and its Organisation in Primitive and Catholic Times p. 202; cf. p. 249.

⁽⁴⁾ See above p. 268, note 1.

prophecy⁽¹⁾ and to evangelise (Joel 3.1,5), that is, to speak the wonderful works of God so that people understand. The speaking with other tongues in Ac.2.4 may be traced to the prophecy in Is.28.5-13 in which the day of the LORD is to be characterised by God speaking with a kind of stammering which will be an awesome counterpart of the stammering for which his prophet has been mocked by the leaders of Israel; vv.11f. states: *διὰ φασιλισμόν χειλέων διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας, ὅτι λαλήσουσιν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ λέγοντες αὐτῷ Τοῦτο τὸ ἀνάπαυμα τῷ πεινῶντι καὶ τοῦτο τὸ σύντεϊμμα καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλησαν ἀκούειν.* The parallel is strikingly confirmed by the fact that in Ac.4.11f. Peter quotes Ps.117.22 which closely resembles Is.28.16. The preaching of the disciples at Pentecost is clearly regarded by Luke as the fulfilment of Is.28.5-13 where the message of hope and glory or affliction and curse, of rest or calamity is to be proclaimed *διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας* in the day on which the Lord of hosts shall be the crown of hope, the woven (crown)⁽²⁾ of glory, to the remnant of the people.⁽³⁾ This 'speaking with other tongues' is not to be confused with the 'speaking-with-tongues' of the enthusiasts.⁽⁴⁾ The Rabbis associated their Day of

(1) Cf. Sabatier (The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit, p. 303): "at Pentecost the disciples had become prophets, nabis, in the ancient sense of the word."

(2) ὁ πλεκκίς τῆς δόξης cf. Mt.27.29.

(3) In the OT prophecy one of the reasons for the crisis is the drunkenness of the religious leaders and in the NT passage this accusation is flung back mockingly at the Christians.

(4) As Friedrich (KWB.VI,852.15-29) who seeks to show from Ac. 2.4,17; 4.31; 10.44ff; 11.15 and 19.6 that ecstasy and prophecy cannot be separated in the NT but then proceeds (852.30f.) to show that the prophet in the Pauline churches "ist nicht Seher sondern Wortempfänger und Wortverkündiger." (cf.853.13-854.11). F. infers correctly from I Cor.14.23f. that prophecy is, in contrast to speaking with tongues, a speaking that is understood but if the latter is to be regarded as being the same as that

Pentecost with the day of the giving of the testimony on Sinai in seventy tongues of fire to reach the seventy nations of the earth⁽¹⁾ and in view of the fact that the author of Deuteronomy uses ἀπόφθεγμα for the content of the Song of Moses which is called a μαρτυρία⁽²⁾ it is significant that Luke uses ἀποφθέγγεσθαι for both the speaking with other tongues and the preaching of Peter. In Ac.2.32 Peter says that he and all the disciples (of whom Luke says there were about 120 (1.15)) are witnesses of Jesus whom God raised but this is clearly a reference to the ascension to God's right hand (2.33), Jesus' exaltation to Lordship. When asked by the rulers by what power or name, that is, by what authority they had healed the lame man Peter claimed the authority of Jesus' name, the only one in which there is salvation (4.7-12).⁽³⁾

The Holy Spirit is associated with the testifying of the disciples (1.8; 2.4; 2.17f; 4.8,31,33), Luke uses χάρις to denote the gift with which they had been endowed (2.47; 4.33) and in 5.32 the Holy Spirit is, with the disciples, a co-witness of the incarnation, death and exaltation of Jesus.

mentioned in Ac.2.1ff. then F. must consider that the speaking at Pentecost was also understood even by those who stood around (Ac.2.6). That the Jerusalem apostles were elated cannot be denied but this does not necessarily mean that they were beside themselves any more than Jesus was when he was teaching (Jn.7.20; 8.48); or Paul (Ac.26.24).

(1) See above p. 259, note 2.

(2) Used elsewhere in LXX for the uttering of prophecy, e.g. I Chron.25.1; Mic.5.11; Zach.10.2; Ezek.13,9,19.

(3) Cf. Ps.102.1-3 and the negative expression of this in Dt.28 58-61. Schlier (KWB.V,880-882) points out the latent authority delegated by the Lord which attaches to παρρησία (4.13): "die Parrhesie des vor dem feindlichen Kosmos offen und vollmächtig verkündenden Apostels ist ein Charisma." (881.1f.).

The choosing of seven men to supervise the 'daily ministration' is often taken as an indication of the superior authority of the Twelve by those who wish to emphasise this but there is no special reason for taking the Twelve rather than 'the multitude of the disciples' (6.2) as the subject of καταστήσομεν. The whole church chose the men⁽¹⁾ and the apostles, having prayed, laid hands on them, a sign of the passing on of a teaching authority.⁽²⁾ The visit of Peter and John to Samaria was organised by the apostles at Jerusalem who sent (ἀπέστειλαν) them (8.14); I Cor.15.7 shows that the number of these Jerusalem apostles was more than twelve. When Peter and John lay hands on the already converted and baptised Samaritans (8.12) the latter are said to receive the Holy Spirit. This receiving of the Holy Spirit in Acts is connected with the manifestation of some spiritual gift⁽³⁾ but no indication is given here as to the nature of such a gift. Since, however the source

(1) Cf. Streeter (The Primitive Church, p.261) speaks of one result from which there is no escape: "In the Primitive Church there was no system of Church Order laid down by the Apostles... the Church was an organism, alive and growing - changing its organisation to meet changing needs."

(2) Swete (HDB. Vol.III, p. 85a) shows that the main intention of this action in the OT is that of the devotion to God of the object on which hands are laid and continues "On the whole, it would appear that the fundamental meaning of the symbol was identification by contact with the subsidiary idea of transference." Holl (Ges. Aufs. II, p. 54) attributes the action to the fact that: "Die Apostel zögern auch nicht, aus der Stellung, die sie innehaben, gewisse äussere Rechte für sich abzuleiten." but it could also be due to their recognition of the charisma of teaching with which they had been endowed and no doubt they shared the sentiments of Paul in this regard (I Cor.12.4ff.). Holl has just described the Twelve and James as "eine regelrechte Hierarchie, eine gottgesetzte Ordnung, ein göttliches Kirchenrecht, eine Kirche als Anstalt" and so presumably he must show some consequence of this. Reicke (Glaube und Leben), p.121 takes a harmonising course: "Mann gewinnt also wieder den Eindruck, dass die Verfassung der Urgemeinde gemischt war, indem hier eine oligarchisch-presbyterianische Instanz - die Apostel - und eine demokratisch-synodale - die Gesamtgemeinde - harmonisch zusammenwirkten"

(3) Cf. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 187.

of God's torah in the OT and NT is always the Holy Spirit one can be fairly certain that what the Samaritans lacked was not full membership - this they had received in Baptism - but the fuller instruction which Peter and John were able to provide (cf. Ac.6.4). This interpretation⁽¹⁾ is helped by Jn.7.38f. where the Spirit is described as rivers of living water, which in turn signifies God's word⁽²⁾ and, importantly, by Ac.9.17 where Ananias puts his hands on Saul of Tarsus that he might receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit; then, having been certain days with the disciples in Damascus, Saul straightway proclaimed Jesus to be the Son of God.⁽³⁾ A clue

(1) Dix (Confirmation or the laying on of hands, p.18) interprets the apostles' action as the ordaining of prophets. D. is followed by Lampe (The Seal of the Spirit, pp. 70-75) but L. will not agree that the men are prophets and sees the act rather as an ordination to missionary work. Similarly for the disciples at Ephesus: "They are given the token of their incorporation into the apostolic ministry represented by St. Paul himself, and the Spirit which guides and directs the Church's mission is manifested in them by the visible signs of 'tongues' and prophecy." (ib.p. 76).

(2) Cf. Is.43.19; Prov.13.14.

(3) Lake (The Beginnings of Christianity, V, p. 53) correctly translates ἐλάμβανον (8.17) as "they began to receive"; the use of the imperf. tense shows that the imparting of the Spirit was a prolonged affair. L's attempt to derive from this an indication of some special apostolic power and dignity on the part of the Twelve is vitiated by a reference to a similar action on the part of Ananias (Ac.9.17). According to L. Barnabas also was an apostle 'in the wider sense' (that is one not sent by Jesus in his life-time). It is more than likely that he was given this name because he was filled with the Holy Spirit, as Paul was by Ananias (that is, that he was fully instructed in the testimony of Jesus) and as Stephen and Philip were by the Twelve. NB. Apollos was only instructed in the way of the Lord (= the way of God (Ac.18.25f.)) which may mean that he was a teacher of the law who had been influenced by John the Baptist or, if the Nestle reading be accepted, that he taught accurately the things concerning Jesus. Thus he knew a great deal of the Church's doctrine but had still to be taught that Jesus was the Messiah, a topic on which he concentrated in Corinth (18.28). When the Jerusalem apostles discovered that the Gospel preached by Paul and his companions was exactly the same as their own they recognised them and gave them the right hand of fellowship.

is provided by the story of Peter's rejection of Simon the sorcerer, the teacher of falsehood. Simon betrays himself by offering to pay for ἐξουσία thus implying that the apostles sell their doctrine for money, and this with complete disregard for Prov.17.14,16.⁽¹⁾ This connection of teaching and payment is one of the marks of the false prophet⁽²⁾ and the true apostle of God always reacts violently to any suggestion that his gospel can be bought (cf. Jn.10.12f.), for it is a grace-gift from God. The authority of the witness, then, is the authority of his message, the teaching which is its own reward.⁽³⁾

Eye-witness testimony to historical facts is involved in Ac.10.39 but the section 10.34-48 concerns especially testimony to a truth about God rather than to earthly phenomena as such.⁽⁴⁾ So striking is the similarity of v.41 to Ex.24.9-12 with its talk of Moses and the elders of Israel 'seeing' the God of Israel and eating and drinking that this passage must surely have been in Luke's mind. Again, the testimony of the witnesses in v.42

(1) ἐξουσίαν δίδωσιν λόγοις ἀρχὴ δικαιοσύνης προηγείται δὲ τῆς ἐνδεΐας στάσις καὶ μάχη.... κτήσασθαι γὰρ σοφίαν ἀκαρδίως οὐ δύνησεται.

(2) Ezek. 34.2,8,10; Mic.3.11; I Cor.9.18; I Thess.2.5f; II Pet. 2.3. Sap.6.9-20 gives a clue to Peter's attitude to Simon Magus who has not realised that the wisdom or παιδεία of the Gospel is given to him who asks in the right spirit: especially v.11: ἐπιθυμήσατε οὖν τῶν λόγων μου, ποθήσατε καὶ παιδεύθησεσθε; cf. Jesus' words: Seek and ye shall find... he that seeketh findeth...if ye know how to give good gifts how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. (Lk.11.9-13, cf. Sap.6.12ff.).

(3) Rengstorff (Auferstehung, pp. 137-145) distinguishes between the apostle who owes his position to his relationship with a single person (Jesus) and who also therefore has no traditional authority and the witness who has his ground in the christologically-interpreted Scriptures: "Deshalb ist im Bilde des Apostels das missionarische Moment bestimmend und tritt das apologetische zurück, ohne doch zu fehlen, während es im Bilde des Zeugen gerade umgekehrt ist. Das Bild des Apostels kann deshalb das des Zeugen in sich aufnehmen, aber nicht umgekehrt."

(4) "The apostles, as witnesses, are successors to the prophets." (Casey, The Beginnings of Christianity, V., p. 32).

is summed up as "it is he who was ordained by God to be the judge of living and dead". Finally, the prophets of the OT testify that through Jesus' name whoever believes in him will receive forgiveness. V.44 is very important for it shows the essence of the act of revelation: Ἐτι λαλοῦντος τοῦ Πέτρου τὰ ἑήματα ταῦτα ἐπέπεσεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας τὸν λόγον. The ἑήματα carry the λόγος which the Holy Spirit reveals. Peter and the other witnesses fore-ordained by God have only the authority of men who carry a message which in turn carried the Word of God.⁽¹⁾ Their authority is recognised only by those who 'see' the Word in the words. The Gentiles, having received the Word (11.1) proceed themselves to prophesy as is clear from Ac.11.15 and 15.7-9.⁽²⁾

Peter's authority in Jerusalem is not by any means monarchical.⁽³⁾ Those of the circumcision (presumably men who were within the church but outside the inner circle) were prepared to challenge him;⁽⁴⁾ for a time these Judaisers submitted to Peter's judgement (Ac.11.18) but later they appeared in Antioch to stir up trouble there and to challenge the authority of Paul and Barnabas. Peter supported the Antioch brethren

(1) Cf. the twelve chosen by Joshua who carry the stones for a memorial (μνημόσυνον) (Josh.4.7); cf. I Cor.11.26 where the action of the Lord's Supper 'shows forth'. See also above p. 1 for the etymological affinity between remembering and witnessing. It is significant that in the Gospels μνημεῖον is used for a tomb and that in later ecclesiastical writers μαρτύριον has this meaning.

(2) Behind this lies Ezek.36.24-27 where the gift of the Holy Spirit and cleansing are closely connected with the ability to walk in God's ordinances, to guard his judgements and to do them.

(3) As Grundmann implies (ZNW.39 (1940), pp. 119f.).

(4) Cf. Foerster (ZNW.36(1937), p. 289): "Haben es aber Judenchristen, Judaisten, versucht, die Arbeit des Paulus zu stören, ohne von den führenden Männern in Jerusalem gesandt zu sein, dann müssen sie eine andere Autorität haben, die sie ermächtigt (but not an authority recognised by the apostles): es sind nach unserer Annahme gläubig gewordene Pharisäer, näher Schriftgelehrte."

with a repetition of his previous apologia, claiming that God had witnessed to the Gentiles as to the Jews;⁽¹⁾ the speech in which he does this (15.7-11) carries strong echoes of Ezek. 36. 23, 25-27 and underlines the idea that God's testimony is the new torah which his servants teach, the easy yoke of Jesus which has superseded the unbearable yoke of the traditions of the fathers (15.10). The authority of the witnesses is that of men who, having received the testimony of God by the Holy Spirit, now bear that testimony to others. The reply of James, who seems to have been the chairman of the meeting, contains no word of command, showing that there was no assumption of a superior administrative authority; any authority assumed here by the apostles and elders⁽²⁾ in Jerusalem is that of the better-informed teacher⁽³⁾ over the Antiochian teachers and prophets.

(1) Peter's immediate support for Paul (15.7ff.) makes nonsense of Mundle's talk of the latter's difficulty in getting recognition (ZNW.22(1923), p. 32). M. avers that this difficulty presupposes "das man über das Verhältnis von Geistes und Neuoffenbarung Christi einerseits und überlieferter Autorität andererseits noch keinen völlig geklärten Standpunkt hatte" (op.cit., p. 32), but the distinction made here is false.

(2) Cf. Bornkamm (KWB. VI, 663.15f): "Ac.15:16,4 fungieren ἀπόστολοι und πρεσβύτεροι eindeutig als oberster Gerichtshof und massgebliche Lehrinstanz für die Gesamtkirche" but that they act like a Sanhedrin giving binding commands to lesser authorities (ib.663.17ff.) is not really supportable in view of 15.10. Cf. Hort (The Christian Ecclesia) who admits that the letter to Antioch implies an authority (p. 81) which the evidence will not allow to be more than a moral one (p.83). H. proceeds (p.84): "There is no trace in scripture of a formal commission of authority to the apostles for government from Christ himself. Their commission was to be witnesses by preaching and healing. Hence (p. 85) the authority even of the apostles was moral."

(3) Διαστειλαειν (15.24) is used in II Esd.18.8 to denote teaching instruction or interpretation of the law.

There were leaders (ἡγούμενοι) in Jerusalem, as 15.22 states and these were prophets (15.32). The letter sent from Jerusalem to Antioch omits reference to apostles at Antioch but this is offset by the fact that it also omits reference to elders of whom there must have been a proportion, and in any case, Luke has already described Paul and Barnabas as apostles (14.4).⁽¹⁾ Taken by itself, 15.28 might appear to demonstrate the authority of Jerusalem over Antioch but it must be remembered that the letter is an answer to a request by the church in Antioch for advice⁽²⁾ and all that attaches to the advice given is a very neutral "from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well". Finally, Antioch regards the letter as a παρακλήσις rather than a command (15.31) and when Judas and Silas had exhorted and strengthened the Antiocheans the latter dismissed (!) these 'chief men among the brethren' to those who had sent them. The authority of the Jerusalem church, the original witnesses of the new covenant, is the authority of the testimony itself. The leadership is a prophetic one (cf. 15.22,32).⁽³⁾

(1) Mundle, without saying why, regards this as a piece of carelessness on Luke's part since the title belongs, strictly speaking, only to Paul (ZNW.27(1928), p. 45).

(2) "The elders and fathers are the natural exemplars and exponents of (this) holy wisdom." (Carrington, The Primitive Christian Catechism, p. 67).

(3) The whole procedure is an echo of the instruction in Dt.17.8-13 concerning matters of judgement. Parties must go to Jerusalem to the priests, the Levites and to the judge, (cf. Mt. 19.28) (but NB.20.26f.): καὶ ἐκζητήσαντες ἀναγγελοῦσιν σοὶ τὴν κρίσιν (v.9). James' words διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω show that the Jerusalem Church must have taken literally, up to a point, the instruction in Dt.17.15 that the leader of the people of God should not be a stranger but a brother (!), but it is significant that James' judgement is based on the testimony of the prophets. Cf. Gerhardsson (Memory and Manuscript, p. 235): "Torah had for the Jews an incomparable intrinsic value as bearer of the divine revelation - even as the divine revelation itself. Most important of all tasks is thus to 'seek' i.e. to 'explore' the Torah, to 'strive' with the Torah, to 'preserve' the Torah,

Stephen

Stephen is undoubtedly one of the most active of the early witnesses; the fact that he is given the title *μάετος* (22.20) seems to place him on an equal level with the Twelve, in Luke's eyes, although in the first four verses of ch. 6 Luke appears to give the seven a lower rank than the Twelve. Stephen is described by Paul as a witness of the risen Lord; his qualification for being appointed over the daily ministrations with the other six is that he is *μαετευόμενος*⁽¹⁾ and full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom, that is to say, he is a preacher or teacher of power and knowledge (cf. "full of grace and power" (6.8) and "his wisdom and spirit" (6.10)); he is, presumably, a guardian of the torah in contrast to his opponents. His testimony is that of the prophets; indeed the account of his vision (7.55f.) is given in terms which directly recall Ps.79.14-19 (which is called a *μαετέριον*) and Ps.109.1.

Philip

Among those dispersed at the time of Stephen's martyrdom was Philip, another member of the Seven and therefore *μαετευόμενος* and full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom (6.3). The refugees, says Luke, went everywhere evangelising

to) 'learn' the Torah, to 'teach' the Torah and 'perform' the precepts of the Torah etc." And yet on pp. 250f. G. can say that Ac.15.1ff. records a dispute (translating *στάσις καὶ ἕτησις*) as 'discord and debate' although according to LXX precedent, the phrase might just as well mean 'standing (to read the scriptures) and enquiring' as in II Esd.18.4 and I Esd.7.13. See also I Pet.1.10. Dt.17.18 may even have some significance for the problem of the origin of the Gospels and certainly vv. 17-20 have had an influence on the description of the ideal leader in the Pastoral Epistles.

(1) Cf. above p.11, note 11.

(8.4; cf. 21.8) and Philip was preaching in the town of Samaria, fulfilling Ac. 1.8: "Ye will be witnesses in Samaria." Having preached the gospel in the north Philip proceeds to the desert in the south where he meets in with an Ethiopian⁽¹⁾ eunuch.⁽²⁾ It might appear, in view of 8.15-17, that Luke⁽³⁾ attributes more authority to Peter and John than to Philip⁽³⁾ but it should be kept in mind that the former were sent from Jerusalem simply because Samaria had received the word and in order to see to it that they should also receive the Holy Spirit so that any superior authority they may have is a teaching one. It is significant that there is no question of the Ethiopian's having to return to Jerusalem or of his having to wait for the arrival of a senior official of the church for the laying on of 'apostolic hands'; he went on his way rejoicing (8.39).

With regard to Stephen and Philip the only conceivable authority which might attach to them is that of server of tables and preacher/teacher of the gospel; they are full of the Holy Spirit but can hardly be called ecstasies; rather are they teachers. They may, like the other witnesses of the Bible,

(1) Cf. Zeph. 3.8, 10: Διὰ τοῦτο ὑπόμεινόν με, λέγει Κύριος, εἰς ἡμέραν ἀναστάσεώς μου εἰς μαρτύριον... ἐκ περάτων ποταμῶν Αἰθιοπίας ὁσούσιν θυσίας μοι.

(2) Cf. Is. 56.3-8.

(3) Behm (Handauflegung, pp. 25-34) sees, unnecessarily, a linking of two traditions in 8.14 whereby the Philip story (8.5-13, 26-40) is combined with one in which Peter is the main actor.

be described as having the authority of a divine message given by God.⁽¹⁾ Holl's view⁽²⁾ that Stephen is a *μάετος* by virtue of his having seen the risen Christ in a vision just before his death does not take into account the whole previous history of the word-group in the Bible.

Paul

In Acts Paul is called *μάετος* (22.15), the expression used in 9.15 is 'a chosen vessel' to go to the Gentiles⁽³⁾ and

(1) Friedrich (KWB.II,735. 1-22) says: "Die Unterordnung des Evangelisten unter den Aposteln" is shown in three places but this is not conclusive. (i) That Philip is alms-distributer in Ac.6 does not prevent him from being a missionary and proclaiming the word. (ii) The fact that the order of apostles, prophets, evangelists (Eph.4.11) proves nothing since (a) these refer to grace-gifts rather than officials and (b) in I Tim.2.7 Paul allows his title 'apostle' to follow that of 'herald'; (iii) To imply that because Timothy is Paul's disciple he therefore has a lower authority than Paul *εἰς εὐαγγέλιον* is to go contrary to Paul's own views on this. For Paul it does not matter who preaches (Phil.1.18) or who the apostles are themselves (Gal.2.6); for him the authority lies in the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ. That Timothy had a commission from the Lord as Paul had and that he preached the word as Paul did can scarcely be denied. That Paul held a higher office in the Church than Timothy is difficult to hold if both exercise authority by virtue of the Word. Mundle (ZNW.27(1928), p.40) says that the Apostles' authority "erstreckt sich auch auf die Verfassung der Kirche. Auf ihre Initiative geht die Einsetzung der kirchlichen Ämter zurück.....die Autoritätsstellung der Apostel beruht auf ihrer Beziehung zur himmlischen Welt" (p.41). This is true enough but the connection is effected through the word and they are leaders by virtue of their teaching charisma.

(2) Ges. Aufs. II, p. 107 note 1.

(3) Cf. Is.43.9f. and 49.1-6.

in 26.16 ὑπηρετίης is added to μαρτυς . The authority which Saul had from the chief priests is contrasted with his commission to bear the Lord's name before Gentiles, kings and the children of Israel (9.15).⁽¹⁾ To this end he must receive his sight (in order to be a witness he must be able to 'see' God's salvation) and receive the Holy Spirit, like the servant in Is.42.16 and 44.3. Ac.9.19 states that when Saul received meat he was strengthened and, in view of Heb.5.14; I Cor.3.2; Ac.20.28; I Pet.5.2 etc., Luke may well have in mind the thought of confirmation after instruction; this is supported by v.17 where Ananias comes as a teacher sent by God (9.17; cf. 22.10) and by v.22 where the direct result of Saul's increasing in strength is that he achieves more success in his exposition of the scriptures, demonstrating that Jesus is Christ. Any authority which Paul receives by his commission to testify is the authority of the message which is given to him. Indeed, he sets himself under it (26.19).

After some time Saul is found at Antioch with other prophets and teachers (13.1) and there the Holy Spirit calls for his and Barnabas' separation to the work for which he has called them. This is parallel to the account in Num.8.13-19⁽²⁾ of the separating (ἀφορίζειν , as also in Ro.1.1) of the Levites⁽³⁾ to perform the work of the tabernacle of testimony

(1) Cf. Ps.118.46: καὶ ἐλάλουν ἐν τοῖς μαρτυρίοις σου ἐναντίον βασιλέων καὶ οὐκ ᾤσχυνόμην and Ac.9.14f. Behind Festus' exclamation: Μαίνῃ Παῦλε (26.24) there probably lies the thought of Sap.5.1-4 where the righteous man is reckoned to be mad by those who afflict him; (cf. also Ac. 24.25 and Sap.4.20).

(2) Strathmann (KWB.IV,221-238 esp. 233.18f.), on the other hand, regards the group as a prayer-fellowship (Gebetsgemeinschaft) "die damit indirekt als ein vergeistigter Priesterdienst bezeichnet wird" (234.49f.). According to S. this is the first instance of the important OT cultus-concept being carried over into the purely spiritual Christian service, thus opening up a far reaching development (233.35-39).

(3) NB. Barnabas was a Levite! (Ac.4.36).

(ἐεγάζεσθαι τὰ ἑαυτῶν (1) τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου (2))
 and to devote them to himself. (3) This laying on of hands is
 performed on accredited teachers of the new μαρτύριον (4).
 When the rulers of the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch ask Paul if
 he has a word of παρακλήσις (13.15), that is of prophecy or
 teaching of God's word as Ps. 118.50, 52, 76 and other OT verses
 show, he proceeds to show the Christian word of salvation. (5)
 Paul likens his relationship to the Gentiles to that of the
 Galilean disciples to the Jews (13.31f.); both are witnesses,
 evangelists. Paul's only authority for his message is the

(1) ἑεγάζεσθαι is often used for the preaching of the gospel;
 cf. 13.2; 14.26; 15.38.

(2) Strathmann, when he says (Op. cit., 235.14-16): "nicht aber konnte man jene Kultusbegriffe in auszeichnender Weise auf christliche Ämter als solche verwenden. Die neue Gemeinde hatte keine Priester", does not take into consideration Clem. Ad. Cor. I.8.1, or that the Levites were entrusted not only with the sacrificial cultus but also with the teaching and preserving of the testimony (Lev. 10.8-10; Dt. 24.8 and esp. Dt. 33.8-10 where both are linked).

(3) Cf. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 239f.

(4) Cf. Ac. 20.32 where Paul commends (παρατίθεσθαι) the Ephesian elders to the word of God's grace, that is, to the grace-gift of God's word. It is interesting that παρατίθεσθαι is the word used in Ex. 19.7 for Moses' setting the teaching of God before the people and in Mt. 13.24.31 of Jesus setting forth his parables. Brosch, commenting on the laying on of hands makes the following gratuitous statement: "Es ist also eher an andere leitende Persönlichkeiten der Gemeinde von Antiochen zu denken....den diese Männer (Symeon, Lucius und Manahan) standen ja neben Barnabas und Paulus höchstens als gleichberechtigte, nicht aber als Träger eines höheren Ranges." (Charismen und Ämter, p. 163) but it is noteworthy that in the parallel OT passage all the children of Israel (not just Moses, Aaron and the elders) lay hands on the Levites when they are set apart for special work (Num. 8.10). Cf. Daube "The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism", pp. 239f.

(5) This speech bears close resemblances to Is. 50.10-51.5 with its references to φοβούμενος (Ac. 13.16 and Is. 50.10),
 παρακλήσις and παρακαλεῖν (Ac. 13.15 and Is. 51.3), ἀφραση (Ac. 13.26 and Is. 51.2) and σωτήριον (Ac. 13.26 and Is. 51.5).

authority of the message itself and this is simply the fulfilment of the prophetic word of the OT, God's testimony, and that of John the Baptist (13.22ff.). Those who are not children of Abraham (the father of faith) and do not fear God are those who do not know Jesus and the voices, that is the messages, of the prophets (13.26f.). The authority of the witnessing disciples is the authority of God's word which comes home to the hearer when the Spirit also testifies in his heart to God's word of grace⁽¹⁾ (14.3).

When the people of Lystra see the two missionaries as gods, Paul and Barnabas point them to God the creator the source of all authority. On the return journey they visit the churches and choose elders (14.23)⁽²⁾ and commit them into God's hands for the work of the testimony of Jesus, as they had themselves been committed (v.26).⁽³⁾ On their return to Antioch they ascribe their success to God's action (14.27). Always the witnesses are dependent on the leading (16.6,10) and testimony (16.14) of the Lord for κύριος δίδωσιν μοι γλῶσσαν παιδείας τοῦ γνωῖναι ἐν καιρῷ ἥνικα δεῖ εἰπεῖν λόγον. (Is.50.4). The apostles are described by the ventriloquist in Thyatira as the servants of the most high God who publish the way of salvation (16.17) and this salvation is acquired simply by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ. Those who believe the testimony need no other authority but are held together in love.

(1) Strathmann may be right in connecting this testimony with the acts of healing (KWB. IV, 50ff.) but it must always be remembered that the teacher's actions are also part of his doctrine as is pointed out by Gerhardsson (Memory and Manuscript, pp. 183, 186f. and 328). The signs cannot be said to "establish the truth of the Gospel" for non-Christian Rabbis and others had the power of healing; they are simply vehicles of the truth. Gerhardsson (op. cit., pp. 153ff.) would call them 'mnemonics'.

(2) χειροτονεῖν originally means 'to stretch out the hand', 'to choose by vote' and is used by Paul in II Cor. 8.19 of the action of the churches.

(3) Cf. Ac. 13.1-3; Nu. 8.13-19 and above p. 282, note 2.

When Paul speaks to the synagogue in Thessalonica he bases his authority on the testimony of God in the scriptures which some believe but others refuse and in Corinth he is constrained by the word⁽¹⁾ of which he is the servant and which he testifies (18.5) like Ezekiel the prophetic watchman (σκόπος) (33.7-9).

Apollos

If John the Baptist can be called a witness (Jn.1.7) then assuredly his disciple Apollos could claim to be the same in view of Ac.18.25-28. It can scarcely be the case that Apollos was "accurately acquainted with the story of Jesus" but was only "ignorant of Christian baptism, and probably of the Pentecostal coming of the Holy Spirit."⁽²⁾ The baptism of John can mean the preaching or teaching of John for it is something which John proclaimed (κηρύσσειν)⁽³⁾, presumably a pre-baptismal form of instruction. Before he met Aquila and Priscilla Apollos taught accurately 'the things concerning Jesus' but this cannot mean the total Christian message which had to be expounded to him more accurately by the two tent-makers. The situation seems to have been that Apollos, knowing the OT Messianic teaching very thoroughly, was well aware of the things foretold about the coming saviour⁽⁴⁾ and that he had had contact

(1) Taking the reading in κ ABDE: λόγῳ] Πνεύματι in L.P.

(2) Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 351.

(3) Mt.3.1; Mk.1.4; Lk.3.3; cf. Ac.10.37; 13.24 and the interesting 7.30 where Luke reports that the Pharisees and lawyers rejected John's teaching, "the counsel of God", not having been baptised by him.

(4) Ἰησοῦς without the def. art. refers to Jesus of Nazareth, e.g. Jn.6.42; Ac.4.30; 9.5; 10.38; 13.23. When the article is used the meaning can equally well be 'the saviour'. Ac.13.23 gives both words: Σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦς where it is obvious that Ἰησοῦς is the proper name.

with John the Baptist or with John's disciples.. When Aquila and Priscilla saw his fervour and the profundity of his knowledge of the way of salvation they showed him the better way, that is they pointed to Jesus as the fulfiller and fulfilment of the scriptures, as Philip had done for the Ethiopian.

Paul's encounter with the twelve disciples of John at Ephesus (19.1-7)⁽¹⁾ is a parallel to the preceding Apollos story.⁽²⁾ Here Paul explains the true sequel to John's baptismal teaching, viz. that the one to whom John pointed is Jesus.⁽³⁾ After they have been given the necessary

(1) Described by Lake (The Beginnings of Christianity, V, 56f.) as "an important but disconcerting episode" and "tantalisingly obscure" (op.cit., p. 137). This is because he is trying to relate it to the receiving of the Holy Spirit by the Christian at Baptism; but it is only disconcerting and obscure when it is not appreciated that what is given is full instruction in order to give a teaching qualification. It is specially noteworthy that Paul reminds the Ephesian elders of how from the first day that he came into Asia he had taught them (20.20f.) the same gospel or testimony as Jesus had taught (cf. Mk.1.15), keeping back nothing vv.18-21, declaring the whole counsel of God (v.27), and all this is summed up in v.28: "the Holy Ghost has made you overseers to feed (that is, to teach) the church of God. Cf. Clem. Ad. Cor. 42-44, where the apostles are said to approve by the spirit as fit for office their first-fruits and are compared (43.1) to Moses the faithful servant (θεράπων) who noted down in the sacred books all the injunctions which were given him and the other prophets followed him, συνεπιμαρτυροῦντες to the laws he had given.

(2) And to the account of the imparting of the Holy Spirit to the Samaritans by Peter and John in Ac.8.14-17.

(3) p³⁸ p⁷⁴ HABE omit Χερίστον showing that Jesus is the fulfilment of John's teaching; the man in whom other men must trust for salvation. A significant point is the studied omission of Jesus' name in 13.24-26 although Paul introduces him as the fulfilment of the Psalmist's testimony (13.22f.).

instruction in the new way of God and been baptised Paul lays hands on them, not to give them some new power and authority but to dedicate them to the work of God⁽¹⁾ and they proceed to speak with tongues and to prophesy, that is, to witness as the Galileans did at the beginning in Jerusalem and as Paul did after his association with Ananias and the disciples in Damascus (9.15). Paul's authority here is not that of a bishop passing on 'spiritual' power but that of a teacher passing on an authoritative, life-giving message,⁽²⁾ the testimony of Jesus, which is the spirit of prophecy (Rev.19.10). Those who try to exercise authority in the name of Jesus without his testimony are exposed even by evil spirits (19.13-16).

It is remarkable that there is no mention of Apollos being ordained in any way except by having the way of God expounded more accurately to him, for his ministry of the word was similar to that of Paul (cf. 18.5 and 18.28) and he soon became an influential leader in the Corinthian church, equal in status to Paul and Peter (I Cor.1.12), a status which Paul acknowledges freely but by which he puts little store. For Paul the authority of church leaders is diakonia rather than exousia (I Cor.3.4-7) and the important authority is the grace, the way of God (18.26) given to them all by God (I Cor.3.10). Aquila and Priscilla, although Munck⁽³⁾ does not include them among those with a definite call or a clearly defined authority, must nevertheless have had a position of importance as teachers; they

(1) Cf. Lev.1.4, Num.8.10f.

(2) "Die Autorität der Apostel ist die Autorität ihres Zeugnisses und das Zeugnis gibt nicht ohne die Vollmacht der Apostel (von Campenhausen, Stud. Theol. (1947/48), p. 129). Cf. Behm (Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum, pp. 21f.): 'The Spirit does not exhaust itself in these extraordinary phenomena (Glossolalia) for it is a permanent inner possession of the Christian teacher... all Christians have the Spirit so it is arbitrary to understand it as only tongues and prophecy in 19.6.'

(3) Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, p. 209.

give full instruction to Apollos, they have a house-church and Paul calls them *κυριαρχοί*. Paul's only concern is to fulfil the prophetic ministry which he has received from the Lord Jesus, of testifying the gospel of the grace of God (20.24).⁽¹⁾

In his speech to the Ephesian elders (20.17-35), who may well have included some or all of the twelve disciples of John, Paul reminds them that he has fully trained them (20.27) for their work of oversight of the flock for which the teaching of the Holy Spirit has fitted them.⁽²⁾ This exercise of *ἐπισκοπή* must be regarded as preaching and teaching the word.⁽³⁾ Faithful teaching of the true testimony of Jesus is going to be necessary because false teachers, called grievous wolves (20.29),⁽⁴⁾ will enter in among them and Paul commends them again

(1) 'This Gospel of the grace of God' means 'this Gospel of the kingdom of God' (20.25) which Jesus himself preached; it is the gospel of repentance and faith (20.21). "Hier ist die Analogie des Prophetensprachgebrauchs am stärksten." (Schniewind, *KWB*.I, 63.23).

(2) Cf. Beyer (*Die Apostelgeschichte*, p. 126): "Vom Geist sind sie berufen in unmittelbarer charismatischer Begnadung" but it must be added that at the same time they have been carefully instructed by Paul (v.20).

(3) That the elders are hierarchical officials in the modern sense as Brosch maintains (*Charismen und Ämter*, p. 139) cannot be gathered from this passage. B's remark: "Apg.20.28 ist veilmehr ein treffender Beweis dafür, wie sehr die Urkirche auch im Amte das charismatische Elemente betonte, ohne damit den Amtscharakter der als Bischöfe über die ganze Herde eingesetzten Presbyter selber preiszugeben" does not sit very easily with his earlier statement about the suspicion in which the charismatics were held in the early church: "Durch das ganze Urchristentum zieht sich dieses gesunde Misstrauen der Kirche gegen den Prophetismus, wie vor allem die Didache (11)" (*op. cit.*, p. 84). B. has failed to distinguish between the authentic prophecy of the true prophet which is truly charismatic (that is, born of, given by the Holy Spirit of God) and that of the false prophets (who are either misleading or mercenary) which should not really be called charismatic but rather ecstatic.

(4) Cf. Mt.7.15; 10.16; Lk.10.3; Jn.10.12; II Pet.2.1.

to the word of God's grace⁽¹⁾ which has the power to build them up. In vv. 33ff. Paul reminds them of the ideal of his own ministry (far removed from an official, paid status).

The Authority of the Testimony

Here again is seen the emphasis on the ministry and message of Jesus. The message of the witnesses is the message of Jesus ("All that Jesus began both to do and to teach (Ac.1.1); The commandments given by Jesus to the disciples during the forty days⁽²⁾ were given διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου⁽³⁾ and his appearances were ἐν τεκμηρίοις.⁽⁴⁾ The testimony carries the authority of the Holy Spirit and imparts it to the witnesses.⁽⁵⁾ The authority of the preaching at the first Pentecost was recognised by those who acknowledged the meaning of their own national history and the validity of their scriptural prophecy; by others it was ridiculed (2.13) for its power was persuasive rather than coercive; everything depends on whether the hearer will gladly receive the testimony of the scriptures and that of the witnesses of the resurrection which point to Jesus as the exalted saviour and king. The teaching at Pentecost is definitely regarded by Luke as a charisma (2.16-18); it is the name or the logos of Jesus which makes the lame man whole⁽⁶⁾ and not any power or holiness in Peter and John (3.12,16). The testimony of the church is the fulfilment of the testimony of the scriptures (3.18); the testimony of Jesus succeeds that of Moses (3.22) and has the same function; it is

(1) As he himself had been in Antioch (Ac.13.2f; cf.14.3 and 15.40.

(2) Cf. Ex.24.18; the period during which Moses was given the torah on Sinai.

(3) Cf. Josh.23.16; Jud.2.20; Jer.11.4; Ps.110.9; Sir.45.3-5 and esp. Dt.4.13.

(4) See above p. 266, note 2.

(5) Ac.2.4; 4.31; 5.32; 7.51; 8.20; 10.44-47 etc.

(6) Cf. Ac.9.15; Jn.17.6,25f. support this interpretation as do also Mt.10.20,22.

the word of God to recall men from their sins to him (3.26) and the obedience demanded in Acts is obedience to the faith rather than to the proclaimers of it (4.7-18). It is the faith which the Christian witnesses are to testify;⁽¹⁾ it was not Stephen's pedigree or official position but his wisdom and spirit which his opponents found irresistible (6.10) and when they set up false witnesses it was to give a perversion of his doctrine (6.11) for they regarded this not as the fulfilment of Moses' law but as its destroyer (6.14). Stephen's testifying was in fact an attempt to persuade the Jews that the testimony revealed by God through Moses and relayed by the prophets was more important than the temple which housed it. It is a corollary that they reject Jesus in whom the word tabernacled (Jn. 1. 14) and that they are like their fathers in rejecting the testimony⁽²⁾ and the prophets who testified.⁽³⁾

There are close similarities between the accounts of Saul's conversion in Acts and the vision in Daniel 10 which predicts the coming of the Messiah showing that, for Luke at any rate, the appearance of Christ was a spiritual phenomenon whatever the surrounding circumstances may have been:

(1) Cf. Rengstorf (Apostolat und Predigtamt, p. 61): "Hier (Acts 4.20) kommt die persönliche Bindung des Amtsträgers an den Inhalt seines Auftrags so stark zum Ausdruck, dass jede Möglichkeit fehlt, den Amtsträger von seiner Verkündigung zu isolieren, einerlei, ob nun er selbst ein Interesse daran haben sollte oder ob man von aussen her versuchen wollte, ihn zum Schweigen zu bringen. Es gibt eben keinen Weg, die apostolische Verkündigung zu ersticken, ausser dem, dass man dem Apostel gewaltsam den Mund schliesst."

(2) Num. 27.14.

(3) II Chron. 36.16; 24.19.

Daniel

καὶ διενόηθην αὐτὸ ἐν
ὄρατι. (10.1).

(ὀπτασία, (Θ)).

ἄετον ἐπιθυμιῶν οὐκ ἔφαγον,
καὶ κέας καὶ οἶνος οὐκ
εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ στόμα
μου τὰς τεεῖς
ἐβδομάδας τῶν ἡμερῶν. (10.3).

καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ
ᾧσεϊ ὄρασις ἀστραπῆς.
(10.6).

καὶ εἶδον ἐγὼ Δανιηλ τὴν
ὄρασιν . . . καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ
ὄντες μετ' ἐμοῦ οὐκ
εἶδον τὴν ὄρασιν. (10.7).

καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀκούσαί με αὐτοῦ
ἤμην κατανευγμένος. (10.9, (Θ)).
cf. 10.15

ἐγὼ ἤμην πεπτωκὼς ἐπὶ
πρόσωπόν μου ἐπὶ τὴν
γῆν. (10.9).

καὶ ἰδοὺ χεῖρα προσήγαγέ
μοι. (10.10).

Acts

καὶ εἶδεν ἄνδρα ἐν ὄρατι.
(9.12).

(τῇ οὐρανίῳ ὀπτασία. (26.19)).

καὶ ἦν ἡμέρας τεεῖς μὴ
βλέπων, καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν
οὐδὲ ἔπιεν. (9.9).

περιήστραψεν φῶς ἐκ τοῦ
οὐρανοῦ. (9.3; cf. Lk. 17.24).

οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες
αὐτῷ εἰστήκεισαν ἐνεοί . . .
. . . μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες.
(9.7).

σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα
λακτίζειν. (26.14; cf. 2.37;
Ἀκούσαντες δὲ κατενύγησαν
τὴν καρδίαν).

καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.
(9.4).

καὶ ἐπιθέντα αὐτῷ χεῖρας.
(9.12; cf. 9.17).

Daniel

καὶ στήθι ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου
σου. (10.11).

ἀπεστάλην ἐπὶ σέ.
(10.11).

ὥς ομοίωσις χειρὸς ἀνθρώπου
ἡψατό μου τῶν χειλέων.
(10.16).

καὶ ἡψατό μου καὶ
κατίσχυσέ με καὶ εἶπέ
μοι . . . ὑγίαινε· ἀνδρίζου
καὶ ἴσχυε . καὶ ἐν τῷ
λαλήσαι αὐτὸν μετ' ἐμοῦ
ἴσχυσα. (10.18f.).

ἀλλ' ἢ ἀναγγελῶ σοι τὸ
ἐντεταγμένον ἐν γραφῇ
ἀληθείας. (10.21, 4).

Acts

ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι.
(9.6; cf. 9.11).

ὁ Κύριος ἀπέσταλκεν με.
(9.17).

ὅπως . . . πλησθῆς Πνεύματος
Ἁγίου.

(9.17; cf. 22.15: ὅτι
ἔση μάρτυς αὐτῷ). (cf. 26.16).

καὶ ἐπιθείς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς
χεῖρας εἶπεν . . . καὶ εὐθέως
ἀπέπεσεν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν
ὀφθαλμῶν ὥς λεπίδες
ἀνεβλεψέν καὶ
λαβὼν τροφήν ἐνίσχυσεν.
(9.17-19).

ἔστηκα μαρτυρούμενος . . .
οὐδὲν ἔκτος λέγων ὧν, τε
οἱ προφῆται ἐλάλησαν μελλόντων
γίνεσθαι καὶ Μωϋσῆς.
(26.22).

In the first two narratives in Acts there is no mention of Jesus giving Saul any commission or teaching; in answer to his request for instructions he is simply told to go into Damascus where he will be told what he must do. In the speech to Agrippa there is no mention at all of Ananias but it is possible that this account is telescoped and that 26.16-18 really applies to what Saul learned in the city. It would appear then that certainly in the first two accounts of Saul's conversion and possibly in the third there is no commissioning except through the Damascus church. Certainly in the Daniel passage in ④ on which the accounts are largely modelled the purpose of the vision is simply that a λόγος should be revealed to Daniel (10.1) that he should understand (10.11) what is ordained in the scripture of truth (10.21). It would seem that for Luke the important matter is the receiving of the testimony of scripture to Jesus - the restoration of his sight and his being filled with the Holy Spirit (9.17)⁽¹⁾ - which issues in testifying (9.27,29). It is this knowledge which shatters, for Saul, the authority of the chief priests (9.14, 21).

In Peter's speech to Cornelius the word is described as the good news of peace sent by God by Jesus Christ the Lord of all (10.36). This word is what Jesus did and the disciples are witnesses of it (10.39) but this does not necessarily refer to eye-witness testimony in view of Sir.24.32f: ^αἐτι παιδείαν

(1) Cf. 9.31: τῇ παρακλήσει τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπληθύνετο. Daube (The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 242f) will not admit that the act of Ananias is any more than a healing act which will produce the last phase of a change of heart and will be followed by the gift of the Spirit from heaven; but it is the Spirit who heals, as Jesus healed.

ὡς ὁ θεὸς φωτισῶ καὶ ἐμφανῶ (1) αὐτὰ ἕως εἰς μακρὰν· ἔτι διδασκαλίαν ὡς προφητεῖαν ἐκχεῶ. (2) According to 10.42 the testimony which Jesus commanded the disciples to give is the proclamation that he is the one ordained by God to be the judge of living and dead (this fits in with the already-noted prophecies Is.2.4 and Mic.4.4) and to grant forgiveness of sins (10.43). Peter's preaching falls on the ears of Cornelius and his company with authority and they receive the gift of the Holy Spirit so that they also speak with tongues and magnify God. (3) The message is thus seen to be a charisma, the baptism of the Holy Ghost (11.16; cf. 13.43; 14.3,26) which precedes water-baptism. The word of salvation (11.14) is the testimony of the witnesses of Jesus which rouses faith and a desire to spread the message, that is, to become a witness in turn, (4) this idea is repeated in 13.43. (5) Holl's separating of testimony and charisma is seen clearly in these words: "Charisma und Tradition entstehen also nicht in beträchtlichen zeitlichen Abstand voneinander so dass der Überlieferungs-gedanke schon ein Sinken voraussetzte, sondern beides erwächst fast gleichzeitig und anderselben Stelle. Und zwar so dass der Überlieferungsgedanke sich sofort über das Charisma erhebt. Denn an die Höhe, auf der die Christuserscheinungen standen,

(1) This is the A reading; cf. Ac.10.40; τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἠγάγει ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι.

(2) Cf. Sap.6.22. Ex.2.14 shows ἐμφανές for a matter having been made known. Mic.4.1f. and Is.2.2f. speak of the temple being ἐμφανές (112 = 'established' or 'raised up'!) so that all nations (cf. Is.65.1) may come to it to learn God's way, paths, law, word. Cf. Jesus' reference to his body as a temple (Jn. 2.19,21, Mk.14.58. Ἐμφανίσκειν is used when Moses asks God to reveal himself to prove his intention, to which God replies: "No man shall see my face and live." (Ex.33.13,20).

(3) Μεγαλυνόντων (10.46) means 'proclaiming God's mercy and truth, that is, his works' as in Ps. 91.2,6,14f; cf. Sir.43.27-31

(4) Cf. Is. 44.3-8.

(5) Cf. Tit. 2.11; Heb. 12.15; I Pet. 5.12.

vermöchte keine Wirkung des Charisma hinanzureichen."⁽¹⁾ This is due to a confusion of the thought of charisma and enthusiasm which is not warranted by the close connection in scripture between the Holy Spirit and the testimony of Jesus.

The testimony which Paul and Barnabas deliver in Pisidian Antioch is the same as that of the Galilean disciples; it is the unchanging message of God's testimony which has now been fulfilled in Jesus. This word of God is called the grace of God (13.43f; cf. 14.3, 26). The testimony of the word of grace is a message which can have no external sanctions; it is taught to people who either believe or disbelieve (14.3f.); it may be departed from after it has been accepted (14.22) but it remains the same.

In his farewell to the Ephesian elders Paul lays great stress on his own faithfulness to the testimony in which he serves the Lord⁽²⁾ (20.19-24). He describes his testimony as the whole counsel (βουλή) of God⁽³⁾ (20.27) and so, for Luke, it has an affinity with the teaching of the Baptist (Lk. 7.30). When the Ephesians believed the testimony of Paul they themselves became witnesses whose task it was to feed, that is, to teach the flock (20.28)⁽⁴⁾. Paul says that it is the Holy Spirit who has made them ἐπίσκοποι.⁽⁵⁾ The word of God's grace which is able to build them up and give them an inheritance with all the saints has been given to them by the Holy Spirit.

⁽¹⁾ Ges. Aufs. II, p. 51.

⁽²⁾ Beyer (KWB. II, 88.3-11), as throughout his article, speaks of the διακονία of 20.24 as an aspect of the Apostelamt.

⁽³⁾ βουλή is used frequently in the LXX for torah, e.g. Ps. 32.11; 72.24; Prov. 9.10, 10a; 21.30; Sap. 6.4; Is. 4.2; Jer. 18.18 etc.

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. Eph. 1.13, 17f; 4.11-16, 29.

⁽⁵⁾ Hatch's view, (The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches, pp. 36-46) that ἐπίσκοποι were officers of administration and finance rests on the unlikely assumption that the Church borrowed the term from secular Hellenistic organisations rather than from the LXX.

(20.28,32; cf. Eph.4.7,11f.); it is, in other words, a charisma and the authority of the testimony is the authority of the truth of God.

8 In his speeches before the council in Jerusalem (23.6), before Felix (24.15,21) and before Agrippa (26.5-8) Paul preaches the message of the general resurrection and in 26.23 he preaches Jesus as the first fruits of this. Right to the end of Acts the testimony is presented as a message which depends for its acceptance on the accompanying testimony of the Holy Spirit, it is believed by some and scorned by others (28.24-27). The message itself is the salvation of God⁽¹⁾ which, having been rejected by the Jews, is now sent to the Gentiles (28.28).

The Transmission of the Testimony

One of the accusations which Stephen made against his judges was that they had received the law and had not guarded it (7.53). The new covenant also depends on faithful transmission and Peter in his address to Cornelius says that Jesus has instructed his disciples to preach and testify to the people (10.42). The Book of Acts is the story of their obedience to a message which is absolutely exclusive and indispensable and compelling (4.12,20). When new converts were made at Pentecost it is recorded that they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine (2.42) which shows that there was a continual work of instruction and preaching. At the after-meeting in Pisidian Antioch Paul and Barnabas persuaded the Jews and proselytes to continue in the grace of God, that is, in their doctrine (13.43). It is possible that the reason for the visit of Peter and John to Philip's Samaritan converts was to give them fuller instruction that teachers might be trained to carry on the tradition of the testimony. The Twelve had declined other

(1) Cf. Ps.66.3.

work in Jerusalem in order to concentrate on prayer and the service of the word; so it is hardly likely that they travelled all the way to Samaria simply to pray; in fact they went there to confer authority, the only kind of authority known to the early church, the authority of the testimony which their Lord had given them to give to the world, the authority of the teacher (8.18f.) which is the testimony itself.⁽¹⁾ Simon Magus is refused the gift because his request has demonstrated his unfitness to impart this testimony; he is still in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity (8.23).⁽²⁾ In Acts much stress is laid on the confirming, strengthening and exhorting of disciples or learners to ensure a faithful adherence to a transmission of the message of Jesus;⁽³⁾ this is seen very clearly in the care taken by Aquila and Priscilla to expound the way of God more accurately (ἀκριβέστερον, cf. Lk.1.3) to Apollos (18.26).

The most important passage in Acts having a bearing on this subject is Paul's farewell speech to the Ephesian elders. Here the apostle insists that they about whose training in the faith he had been so solicitous must be careful to feed the flock because he can foresee the imminent danger of false teaching⁽⁴⁾ which will distort the word of grace which alone is able to build them up (20.28-32).

(1) Cf. Behm, *Die Handauflegung*, p. 21.

(2) Cf. Dt.29.17-20 and by contrast, the root of wisdom in Sap.3.15, Sir.1.6,20,25,30.

(3) 9.31; 11.23; 14.22; 15.32,41; 16.40; 18.23; 20.2,32.

(4) Ἄνθρωποι is the term Paul applies to the false teachers, following the example of Jesus himself (Mt.7.15; 10.16; Jn.10.12). Cf. Zeph.3.3f. where Israel's judges (i.e. elders and Levites;

The idea of succession is embedded in the earliest documents of the church but it is a succession which is doctrinal, not institutional.⁽¹⁾

Conclusion

The term μαρτυς is used in Acts to designate not simply an eye-witness of the events of Jesus' life, death and resurrection (although some of the μαρτυρες were actually eye-witnesses) but a teacher of Jesus' testimony, that is, his doctrine about himself, the things pertaining to the kingdom of God. To testify is to proclaim the prophetic word which points to God in Christ as creator, law-giver, redeemer and judge.

Authority in the Church is dependent primarily on possession of and obedience to the authentic testimony. When the Church recognises this authority in anyone he may be appointed to an official task. There is no difference in levels of authority as between the witnesses except in respect of the thoroughness of their knowledge of the testimony.

In Acts the testimony is seen to be a charisma; it is the baptism of the Holy Spirit and yet, to Luke's mind, it is to be a permanent possession of the Christian, a doctrine which must be guarded against the false teachers and passed on accurately (βεβαιως).

see Thatcher, Article on Judges, in HDB.II, pp. 806f.) are described as wolves; "Her prophets are light and scornful men, her priests profane the holy things and sinfully transgress the law" and a similar passage in Ezek. 22.23-29 where the wolf signifies one who seeks dishonest gain - a frequent description of false teachers in the NT.

(1) In this connection Bultmann (Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 59) puts Jesus' message in a place secondary to "the specifically Christian kerygma" but these have now been shown to be one and the same in principle.

CHAPTER XIIITHE TESTIMONY OF PAUL AND HISDISCIPLES AND COMPANIONS(1) I AND II THESSALONIANSThe Nature of the Testimony

When the earliest NT documents are examined it is found that Paul follows the OT in its use of the μαρτυς-group in connection with the teaching of God's word. In I and II Thessalonians there are three passages which support this view. In II.1,10 Paul refers to the μαρτύριον which he and Silvanus and Timothy gave to his readers.⁽¹⁾ Now Ps. 49 contains the word διαμαρτύρεσθαι in a strikingly similar context, viz. the declaration of God's word, and it is clear from the following parallels that Paul, by his use of μαρτύριον in this passage, is associating the gospel of our Lord Jesus (II.1.8) with the testimony of God (Ps. 49.7⁽²⁾ and Is. 66⁽³⁾) as Jesus himself did.

(1) Luke's account of Paul's activity in Thessalonica (Ac.17.1-3) uses expressions associated with this μαρτύριον, viz. διελέξατο ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν, διανοίγων καὶ παρατιθέμενος and καταγγέλλω.

(2) Cf. Rigaux, Les Epîtres aux Thessaloniens, p. 635 and Sass, Apostelamt und Kirche, pp. 40-43.

(3) Where God's word is concerned with his righteous judgement (vv.5f; cf. II Thess. 1.5), giving of rest to the saints (v.12; cf. II Thess. 1.7,10), the impending fire and whirlwind (v.15; cf. II Thess. 1.7f.), the saints' trembling at the Lord's word, (i.e. believing in him (v.5; cf. II Thess. 1.3f.,10)) and the wicked choosing their own ways (v.3; cf. II Thess. 1.8).

II Thess.Ps.49.

ἔνδειγμα τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως
τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ
καταξιωθῆναι ὑμᾶς τῆς
βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ (1.5).

καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς θλιβομένοις
ἄνεσιν μεθ' ἡμῶν (1.7).

ἐν πυρὶ φλογός (1.8).

ὅταν ἔλθῃ, ἐνδοξασθῆναι
ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ (1.10).

Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί,
ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ
Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ι.Χ. (2.1).

καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ'
αὐτόν (2.1).

καὶ ἀναγγελοῦσιν οἱ οὐρανοὶ
τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, ὅτι
ὁ Θεὸς κρίτης ἔστιν (v.6).

καὶ ἐπικάλεσαί με ἐν ἡμέρᾳ
θλίψεως, καὶ ἐξελοῦμαί σε (v.15).

πῦρ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ καυθήσεται (v.3).

καὶ δοξάσεις με (v.15).

ὁ Θεὸς ἐμφανῶς ἥξει (v.2).

Συναγάγετε αὐτῷ τοὺς ὁσίους
αὐτοῦ (v.5).

Paul commends the Thessalonians ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς (II.1.10); they are not, like the wicked who hate instruction and cast God's words behind them (Ps.49. 16f.) and to whom God testifies, unworthy to declare his statutes or to take his covenant in their mouth. The similarity between the two passages extends to their content.

Secondly, in I Thess.2.9-12 Paul says to his readers that they are witnesses (μάρτυρες), and God also, of how he and Silvanus and Timothy have proclaimed the gospel and lived

blamelessly and he continues: καθάπερ οἶδατε ὡς ἓνα ἕκαστον ὑμῶν ὡς πατὴρ τέκνα ἑαυτοῦ παρακαλοῦντες ὑμᾶς καὶ παραμυθούμενοι καὶ μαρτυρόμενοι. In this verse the juxtaposition of μαρτυρόμενοι and the other two participles indicates that it is being used here in the sense of teaching or preaching.⁽¹⁾ Paul is concerned in chapter 2 to underline not only the blameless behaviour⁽²⁾ but also the fidelity to the gospel of his companions and himself and so it is unlikely that the aim of the participles is simply ethical instruction (I.2.12). Παράκλησις and παραμυθία⁽³⁾ are closely linked to οἰκοδομή in I Cor. 14.3 as the functions of the prophet⁽⁴⁾ showing that prophecy and instruction are practically interchangeable for Paul.⁽⁵⁾

(1) See above p.13, line 10; against Lightfoot: Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, p. 29 and von Dobschütz (Die Thessalonicher-Briefe, p. 101): "μαρτυρόμενοι steht hier im Sinne des Beschwörens."

(2) He and his companions were true to the scribal code in 'not using a cloak of covetousness'. (cf. I Pet 5.2; Aboth 4.9; Bekk. 4.6: "If a man takes payment for acting as a judge, his judgements are void, if for bearing witness, his witness is void.")

(3) See Stählin (KWB, V, 819) for the close similarity of παρακαλεῖν and παραμυθεῖσθαι and for the prophets as bearers of Christian 'comfort' (pp. 820 f.).

(4) Cf. Greeven, ZNW, 44 (1952), p. 37.

(5) This is supported by Luke's interpretation of the name given to Barnabas (בָּרְנָבָא = 'son' and נְבִיא = 'to prophesy') as υἱὸς παρακλήσεως (Ac. 4.36); cf. Lam. 2.9,13: οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης αὐτῆς οὐκ εἶδον θρασὺν παρὰ κυρίου τί μαρτυρήσω σοι τίς σώσει σε καὶ παρακαλέσει σε and II Macc. 15.8f: καὶ παρακαλεῖ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ παραμυθούμενος αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ νόμου

καὶ τῶν προφητῶν
(1952), p. 37.

. See also Greeven, ZNW, 44

The third relevant text is I Thess. 4,6: ἕκδικος Κύριος καθὼς καὶ διαμαρτυράμεθα ⁽¹⁾. The context is an appeal by Paul to the Thessalonians to abound in the life pleasing to God and the meaning of διαμαρτυρεσθαι here is simply 'to teach' (absolute).

The Content of the Testimony

Paul's message contains the same four elements as the OT μαρτύριον; it is the original prophetic testimony, the teaching of God (I.4.9) which is linked quite naturally with the word of Jesus (I.4.15-17; I.5.1f.) since it is his gospel (II.1.8). ⁽²⁾ Just as in the Psalm there is found the familiar four-fold message, so in I Thess. evidence can be found in the first two chapters of a similar subject-matter of the preaching of Paul and his disciples: (a) The word of the Lord includes the requirement of turning from idols to serve the living and true God (1.8f.) and concerns his kingdom (2.12). (b) The word of God includes an emphasis on the good life (1.3; 2.3,10,11f.) (c) Paul's missionary preaching includes reference to the death of Jesus and the salvation which it effects (2.15f.) (d) This preaching emphasises faith in the second coming of the

(1) Διαμαρτυρεσθαι is used frequently in the OT for 'speaking God's word', e.g. IV K.17.13. Note: in Ac.10.42 διαμαρτυρεσθαι is used with παραγγέλλειν and κηρύσσειν with the same content.

(2) See Cullmann (The Tradition, p. 64) for the content of the παράδοσις according to St. Paul. Cullmann, however, still feels that "the primitive paradosis probably consisted of a summary of the kerygma". It is extremely difficult to believe that the kerygma was ever as perfunctory a matter as it is usually made out to be. Against Bultmann (The Theology of the New Testament, I, pp.188f.) "All that is important for him (Paul) in the story of Jesus is that Jesus was born a Jew and lived under the Law and that he had been crucified.....In relation to the preaching of Jesus the theology of Paul is a new structure."

saviour (1.8-10; 2.19). In II Thess. there is reference to (a) the kingdom of God, (b) obedience to the law, (c) salvation and (d) judgement issuing in destruction or glory (1.5,8; 2.13; 1.9,12).⁽¹⁾

The Authority of the Witnesses

Paul does not regard himself simply as an eye-witness of the resurrection of Jesus but as a witness in the sense of a preacher or teacher of the gospel which is also called the truth (II.2.10), the word of the Lord (II.3.1),⁽²⁾ the faith (I.3.2), the tradition(s) (II.3.6; II.2.15).⁽³⁾ The traditions have

(1) Filson (JBL. LX (1941), pp. 326-327) identifies the teacher with the modern preacher and pastor rather than with the university instructor and reckons that there was no fixed, memorised tradition, rigid and severely controlled. He allows, however, the probability of some kind of framework in order to give enquirers a clear idea of who Jesus was and of his significant actions.

(2) Riesenfeld (The Gospel Tradition, pp. 14f.) claims with justice that the Sitz im Leben of the tradition of the words and deeds of Jesus was 'sui generis'. cf. Cullmann (The Tradition, pp. 60f.): "instead of 'tradition' Paul sometimes says 'the Lord' (Kyrios), as, for example, in quoting words of Jesus (I Thess. 4.15; I Cor. 7.10,25; 9.14." (p.60) and "the words 'I received it from the Lord' mean 'I received it through a chain of tradition which begins with the Lord'" (p.62).

(3) παραδίδοναι and παραλαμβάνειν are often used technically in the NT for the transmission and reception of a tradition; cf. above p.198, note 3. Riesenfeld (The Gospel Tradition, pp. 17f): "The terminology used of the Jewish process of tradition re-appears in the New Testament".... παραλαμβάνειν and παραδίδοναι refer to "the rigidly controlled transmission of matter from one who has the mastery of it to another who has been specially chosen to learn it".... "the oral tradition was esoteric in the sense that it was not entrusted to everyone nor was it at everyone's disposal to use as he wished." Fridrichsen (Jesus, St. John and St. Paul, pp. 38-40) denies that Paul is "a disciple who having been moulded in the school of Jesus handed down the tradition" but this leaves out of consideration verses like these

been taught by word of mouth or letter.⁽¹⁾ The apostle does not seem to regard himself as being superior in any way to his readers in Thessalonica; he had come to them with nothing in the way of credentials except a message, a tradition which they might have rejected as others did.⁽²⁾ Any authority which he has is measured by his own fidelity to the message (II.2.5; II.3.6f.,10).⁽³⁾ For any commands which he gives Paul uses $\piαραγγελλειν$ which can mean simply 'to transmit a message'.

and I Cor. 11.2,23; 15.3; Ro.6.17." F. continues: "Jesus never had a disciple of this kind at all", which ignores the choosing of the Twelve 'to be with him' and the teacher-pupil relationship inherent in the titles 'disciples' and 'Rabbi'; cf. Dodd: Jesus as Teacher and Prophet, pp. 53-55 et passim. Fridrichsen admits, however, (p. 45) that "St. Paul's teaching about justification by faith in Christ has its roots and basis in the life and message of Jesus and in principle expresses his will and intention." He equates Jesus' message, "Repent and believe the gospel" with Paul's doctrine of justification.

(1) Cf. Grant (The Gospels, pp.viif) who states that the meaning of tradition in the ancient world was "a fixed body of teaching."

(2) Rengstorff (Apostleship p. 67) states that Paul has significance only through his commission and the Lord who stands behind it, but no one in Corinth could know that Paul had such a commission from the risen Christ any more than the Jews in Jeremiah's time could distinguish between true and false prophets (Jer. 23,26) and the only 'proof' of his commission which he could offer was 'the testimony of Jesus' and the integrity of his own way of life.

(3) See Rengstorff (Apostleship, p. 59) for the apostle, like the prophet, being the servant of his message.

So far from asserting his superiority to them⁽¹⁾ he asks them to pray for him that his preaching may have the same success as theirs has been having. (II.3.1)

The simile of the father teaching his children is in accordance with the OT command that the testimony should be so taught (Dt. 4.9; 6.6f., 20ff; Ps. 77.5; Is. 38.19; cf. I Cor. 4.14f.) and the simile of the nurse has associations with Is. 66. 11, 13: ἵνα θηλάσητε καὶ ἐμπλησθῆτε ἀπὸ μαστοῦ παρακλήσεως αὐτῆς . . . ὥς εἴ τινα μήτηρ παρακαλέσει, οὕτως καὶ ἐγὼ παρακαλέσω ὑμᾶς (cf. I Cor. 3.2; Heb. 5.12; I Pet. 2.2 which refer to 'the milk of the word').⁽²⁾ Here again Paul claims no authority for himself. He makes no show of authority other than that of the Lord,⁽³⁾ (ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν); he speaks of commandments which they have already received from him but these are παραγγελίαι⁽⁴⁾ . . . διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (I.4.2; cf. v.11).

(1) Gerhardsson (Memory and Manuscript p. 294) writes: "When Paul exhorts his congregation he is well aware of his exalted standing as a doctrinal authority", but while it may be granted that the rabbi had such a position in Judaism and that Judaism must have had some influence on the Early Church yet 'exalted position' was hardly what Jesus told his disciples to aim at.

(2) The Hymn Scroll of the Dead Sea Sect. (7.20-22) describes a similar relationship between the Teacher, the true expositor, and his disciples, the men of good omen (מְנִיחֵי טוֹב) "Thou hast (chosen me) and set me as a father to the sons of grace, and as a nurse to men of good omen." (cf. Is. 8.6-18; Zech. 3.6-8)

(3) Bultmann (Op. cit. p. 294) gives no reason for saying that Paul is not thinking of the historical Jesus here.

(4) For any commands which he gives, Paul uses παραγγέλλειν which can mean simply 'to transmit a message' (LS., p.1306.1) In Jer. 26.14 παραγγέλλειν = ἀναγγέλλειν = proclaim or declare. cf. Schmitz (KWB. V, 761f.): "Die entscheidende Autorität ist auch für Paulus das Wort des 'Herrn' . . . haben die Leser es im Wort des Apostels mit dem Herrn selber zu tun."

Paul and his companions have already taught and testified that God demands righteousness from his people. Whoever despises their testimony despises God who is giving his spirit to them also, that is, as well as to the prophets.⁽¹⁾ Again, Paul's authority is measured by his fidelity to the original testimony (I.4.9,15); God is witness μάς to his inward and the Thessalonians to his outward conformity to it (I.2.5,10). They know perfectly (ἀκριβῶς)⁽²⁾ that the day of the Lord comes as a thief in the night.

Timothy, his brother and fellow-worker in the gospel of Christ performs the same functions as Paul himself since he is sent εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλέσαι ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως (I.3.2) and to inform Paul of the state of their faith in case they had been tempted to deny it and so render Paul's labour κόπος,⁽³⁾ in vain. Timothy and Silvanus share Paul's ἐξουσία since they are also apostles of Christ (I.2.7,9) which links them with the Twelve in their mission and authority (Mt.10.1,5,10; Mk.3.15; 6.7-10; Lk. 6.13; 9.1-4) and also with the Seventy (Lk.10.1,7f.). It is obvious that here (I.2.9; cf. II.3.8f.) Paul still claims the right to hospitality while on mission although he does not avail himself of it in practice.

(1) Cf. II Esd. 19.30: καὶ ἐπεμαρτύρω αὐτοῖς ἐν πνεύματί σου ἐν χειρὶ προφητῶν σου.

(2) Denotes careful teaching, cf. Lk. 1.3; Ac. 18.25f; 22.3; 24.22.

(3) Cf. Harnack: ZNW. 27(1928) pp. 1ff.; Hauck: KWB. III, 828f.: "Missions - und Gemeindefarbeit". Harnack (p. 10) sees such people as 'Amtspersonen'. Gore cannot have considered this passage when he wrote (The Expositor. Ser. 3. Vol. 5, pp. 415f.) that when Paul declares that his characteristic duty (I Cor. 1.17; 9.14) is the preaching of the gospel "he is saying about his apostolic office what a local Presbyter-Episcopus could not have said."

Although the Thessalonians themselves are also fellow-workers in the gospel Paul cannot have meant that every member had become a recognised teacher or preacher; there are some who have been engaged in the work of faith and labour of love⁽¹⁾ (I.1.3; cf. I.5.12; II.2.17) and from them the word has sounded forth for they had turned to God from idols to serve the true and living God (I.1.8f). The word of God was effectually working in them for they became imitators of the churches in Judaea in speaking to the Gentiles that they might be saved (I.2.13-16).⁽²⁾ Paul at first sight seems to make no distinction between active and non-active, apparently including the whole membership in his injunction: παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους καὶ οἰκοδομεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἕνα, καθὼς καὶ ποιεῖτε (I.5.11) but the next verse shows that the apostle is aware that in this church there are some who labour⁽³⁾ among them and are over them (προϊσταμένους) in the Lord and admonish (νουθετοῦντας) them and who are to be highly

(1) Von Campenhausen in his Kirchliches Amt und Geistliche Vollmacht seeks to show a distinction between the 'official' position of the apostles in Jerusalem and the 'free' apostleship of Paul's churches and even goes as far as to say: "Paulus kennt keine leitenden Personen, denen er das Evangelium für alle anvertraut....Paulus stellt alles auf den Geist." (p.86) There can, however, be little doubt that I Thess. 1.6; 2.8,11,13; 3.2,10 and other verses are to be linked with 5.12f. and this is confirmed by Ac. 17.4 where it is said that those who believed the gospel were allotted to Paul, that is, as disciples (see Grimm-Thayer on προσκληρώ, p. 547a).

(2) By implication, Paul in 2.15 compares the Thessalonian preachers and Silvanus, Timotheus and himself with the prophets persecuted by the Jews and this together with Paul's attitude towards the former renders suspect the view put forward by J.A. Robinson (The Christian Ministry, p. 90) who writes: "There is no sign that the exercise of their (prophets and teachers) ministry was other than spontaneous or that it either needed or received any formal recognition...nor is there any sign that it gave them any kind of authority."

(3) A reference to the teaching function; cf. I Tim. 5.17. and v. Campenhausen: Kirchliches Amt und Geistliche Vollmacht. p. 70.

esteemed in love. Greeven⁽¹⁾ shows that these leaders exercise a teaching function and it is clear that in Paul's view they have an authority of great importance (ὑπερεκπερισσῶς) (I.5.13) although it should be exercised in a brotherly fashion (II.3.15).⁽²⁾ In I.5.15 they are told to see to it that none returns evil for evil which implies the application of some kind of restraint. Paul asks the Thessalonians to pray for Silvanus and Timothy and himself that the word may run and be glorified just as it does with them.⁽³⁾

Paul in these two earliest documents of the Christian Church claims for himself no authority which is not dependent on the authority, the power to persuade and change, of the message which has been entrusted to him.⁽⁴⁾

There is no indication in either of the epistles of an official, administrative authority or hierarchy on the part of any of the leaders.⁽⁵⁾ Paul and his fellow-workers claim only the right to hospitality as apostles of Christ (I.2.7; II.3.8f.) but even this they have renounced. Paul makes no reference to superiority over others except in respect of knowledge of the testimony, it is this which empowers him to exhort and command.⁽⁶⁾

(1) ZNW. 44(1952), p.37.

(2) Greeven op. cit., p. 37: "Wer die κοπιῶντες und die προϊστάμενοι von den Propheten und Lehrern trennen und unterschieden will, kommt in die Verlegenheit, erklären zu müssen, warum die Gemeinden zu Ehrerbietung und Gehorsam gerade denjenigen Geistträgern gegenüber aufgefordert werden, deren Charisma in allen Aufzählungen an betont nachgeordneter Stelle auftritt."

(3) Cf. Ps. 147.4: ὁ ἀποστέλλων τὸ λόγιον αὐτοῦ τῇ γῇ, ἕως τὰ ὕψη ἀεμεῖται ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.

(4) Cf. Harnack (The Constitution and Law of the Church, p. 189) who points out that the Early Church possessed only one word of God and that it was not legally binding; people must agree to accept it.

(5) Cf. Greeven: ZNW. 44 (1952), pp. 34f; Linton: Das Problem der Urkirche, p. 19.

(6) "ob das Wort des Lehrenden wirklich Gottes Wort ist, entscheidet kein Rechtsatz und keine Tatsache der Vergangenheit

Timothy is sent to strengthen and exhort the Thessalonians in the faith and Paul prays that he may be able to visit them so that he might perfect or instruct them where there are gaps in their knowledge (I.3.10). Those who labour among them and are over them and admonish them (I.5.12⁽¹⁾) are regarded as instructors rather than administrators; in all the advice given in I.5.12-27 everything concerns teaching of doctrine and appropriate behaviour; there is no mention here of administrative or official rule but prophecy and the utterance of the spirit are to be cherished (I.5.19f.).⁽²⁾

sondern allein das gegenwärtige Zeugnis des heiligen Geistes, welcher in den Versammelten lebendig ist." (Sohm: Kirchenrecht, p. 53). But the testimony of the Holy Spirit is surely something which is expressible in words.

(¹) Cf. Greeven (ZNW.44 (1952), p.32, note 74): "Die Diskussion die immer mit die Alternativfrage 'Festes Amt oder freies Charisma?' verquickt ist, kann hier im wesentlichen ausser Betracht bleiben." G. (ib. pp. 32ff.) takes ἐν σπουδῇ (Ro. 12.8) as indicating "die spezielle 'technische' Bedeutung der eifrigen Tätigkeit für die Gemeinde." Cf. Harnack. (ZNW. 27 (1928), pp. 1-10) who shows that Paul uses κοπιᾶν for his missionary activity.

(²) Mundle (ZNW. 22 (1923), p. 20) questions if there was as great a leap from the NT to Catholicism as Sohm makes out and states (ib. p. 32): "Eine reine Pneumatokratie ist die Urgemeinde nicht gewesen....auch nicht die paulinische Kirche Offenbarung des Geistes, die gegen die Grundüberzeugungen der Kirche verstießen, hat man als solche gewiss nicht gelten lassen." Cf. pp. 35f. where M. correctly regards the rule in the NT Church as that which the pneumatics exercised over the community. In asserting (p.36) that the appropriation of the apostles' authority by the presbyter and episkopos through the theory of apostolic succession was not a betrayal of the ideal of the early Church but the necessary consequence of the altered situation Mundle has missed the essential characteristic of the NT leaders' authority, viz. its ground in their life and doctrine. Dobschütz (Die Kirche im Christentum, p. 116) tries to get round the difficulty of meeting Sohm's radical position by saying that in Jerusalem and in Hellenistic Christendom the organisation question played an unimportant part because the generally-ruling enthusiasm placed everything on an arbitrary performance and on that account administration forms were as little necessary as Cult forms. It

The Authority of the Testimony

The claims which Paul makes for the gospel (παράκλησις) with which he and his friends have been entrusted by God (I.2.4) show that its authority depended on its own power to rouse faith in those who heard it so that they accepted it as the word of God, and on its subsequent effectual working in their lives (I.1.9; I.2.13).⁽¹⁾ Obedience is expected within the church but it is obedience to the gospel (I.1.8), that is, to the Lord (II.1.8; cf. Ro. 6.11; II Cor. 10.5; I Pet 3.1; 4.17).

In II Thess. 2.16 Paul states that the παράκλησις is a charisma from God (δοὺς ... ἐν χάριτι)⁽²⁾ and this bears out his previous claim that his gospel came 'by the Holy Spirit' (I.1.5) and that the Thessalonians received the word with joy of the Holy Spirit for in I.2.2f. it is clear that the gospel of God and the παράκλησις are one and the same thing.⁽³⁾ The μαρτύριον is a charisma.

should be understood, however, that Sohm insisted all the time on the teaching authority of the charismatics, claiming that even the control of the eucharist was in the hands of the teachers (Kirchenrecht, p. 69, note 4). Swete (The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, p. 376) shows the important place of the prophets in the teaching ministry of the NT Church: "The prophets seem to have been, in fact, the teaching ministry of the primitive church and to have acquired before the end of the century an influence which overshadowed that of bishops and deacons.....the great purpose of Christian prophecy was to bear witness to Jesus."

(1) Cf. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament. I, pp. 307f.

(2) Cf. II Cor. 1.11 and Sass (Apostelamt und Kirche, p. 38):

"χάρις und ἀποστολή sind fast gleichzusetzen vgl. Röm. 12.3-6auch Röm. 15.15; I Kor. 3.10; Gal. 2.9. So sind auch χάρις und χάρισμα zuweilen synonyma vgl. Röm. 5.15."

(3) I Thess. 2.9,11 link them also with κήρυγμα and μαρτύριον.

The Transmission of the Testimony

Paul's major concern is that the word he preaches should be received, the believers established in it and the message passed on without alteration.⁽¹⁾ He rejoices that the word has sounded forth from Thessalonica (I.1.1-8) and that it effectually works in them (I.2.13) and he sends Timothy to them that they might be established and strengthened in it (I.3.2). He prays that he may be able to visit them himself and perfect them in it (I.3.10) and he urges them to stand fast. When he speaks of their standing fast in the Lord (I.3.8) he is obviously referring to their adherence to the Lord's teaching and when, in II Thess. 2.15 he tells them to hold the traditions they have been taught this is because there are some among the brethren who walk ἀτάκτως (II.3.6,11)⁽²⁾ and not according to the tradition which Paul had passed on.

All this shows that in the early years of the Church's history there was a tradition or gospel⁽³⁾ which, while it may not have been verbally identical in every area, certainly was recognisable and those who guarded its content could easily detect heresy. Harnack⁽⁴⁾ does not admit the possibility of a charismatic authority based only on the teaching and says that

(1) Cf. Daniélou (The New Testament and the Theology of History, p. 30): "Once Christ has appeared on the scene the missionary task is that of παράδοσις, a deposit no longer subject to change."

(2) Cf. Tit. 1.10; I Clem. 42.2: οἱ ἀπόστολοι ... ἐγένοντο ... εὐτάκτως ἐκ θελήματος τοῦ θεοῦ

(3) Cf. Käsemann (ZThK. 48(1951), p. 310): "Alle Tradition hat Sinn nur als Aufruf, die Stimme des gegenwärtigen Christus zu hören. Auch sie bleibt konstitutiv Zeugnis und überhebt darum nie des eigenen Sehens, Hörens und Glaubens." This is true enough but there is also to be taken into consideration the fact that Paul uses the technical terms, παραλαμβάνειν in I.2.13; 1.4.1 and παράδοσις in II.2.15; II.3.6, showing that he regards the content of the tradition as being important.

(4) The Constitution and Law of the Church, pp. 218f.

"the charismatic teachers soon receive the duties and rights of persons set in authority." He avers that the Christian religion is not the private inspiration of the individual but is bound to the tradition of Christ⁽¹⁾ but it is surely wrong to separate Spirit and tradition and confine the activity of the Spirit to 'private inspiration'. The tradition is the testimony of the Lord which acts with the power of the Holy Spirit upon those who believe⁽²⁾ so that they in turn become proclaimers of the word. The bearer of the testimony has an authority but this depends on his faithfulness to it.⁽³⁾ At this stage in the history of the Church there is no reference to any other kind of authority. The witnesses, although the term is not employed, are charismatics who 'possess' the charisma of testimony by the operation of the Spirit (I.1.5.f; 4.8)⁽⁴⁾ and this

(1) Op. cit., p. 207.

(2) Cf. Friedrich (KWB. III, 711.9f.): "Nicht der Inhalt des Gepredigten wirkt, sondern Gott wirkt durch dieses Wort.

(3) Cf. Friedrich (KWB. II, 729,13f.): "Gott beruft durch das Evangelium die Menschen zum Heil, der Prediger ist der Mund Gottes." Lindsay (The Church and the Ministry, p. 19): "He (Paul) bent his whole energies to break down this false principle of continuity which placed the 'succession' in something external, and not in the possession and transmission from generation to generation of the 'gifts' of the Spirit within the community." This, however, must not displace the truth that some members were teachers, holding a special place and a real authority.

(4) Against Brosch who (Charismen und Ämter, pp. 122f.) confuses pneumatics and charismatics, regarding the latter as having, in Paul's mind, no right to set themselves over the congregation - leaders - "Alle Autorität bei den Stiftern der Gemeinde lag, in Jerusalem bei den Altaposteln, (this ignores Ac. 15.22) in fast allen übrigen bekannten Gemeinden, von Kolossä und Rom abgesehen, bei Paulus, der dazu.....seine Verbindung mit den Altaposteln betont." (this ignores I Cor. 4.4-6).

testimony or tradition is not a dead letter but the living Christ⁽¹⁾ who has described himself as the way, the truth and the life and whom Paul in I Tim. 2.6 describes as a *παερεύειον* .

(2) I AND II CORINTHIANS

The Nature of the Testimony

In I and II Corinthians there are seven passages containing the word-group in three of which there is no connection with preaching or teaching. In II.1.23 Paul invokes God as a *μάετος* to his pure motive in delaying his visit to Corinth; in II.8.3 he vouches for (*μαετυεῶ*) the liberality of the churches of Macedonia; in II.13.1 he promises that, in the disciplinary action which he is about to take, the demand of the OT law for two or three witnesses will be met.

In the early chapters of I Corinthians Paul rebukes his readers for jeopardising the proclamation of the gospel by a partisanship which takes as its criterion of excellence what he calls *σοφία λόγου* (I.1.17), *σοφία τῶν σοφῶν* (I.1.19), *σοφία τοῦ κόσμου* (I.1.20) and *σοφία τῶν ἀνθρώπων* (I.2.4) and with which he contrasts the 'foolishness' of the gospel. In I.1.4-8 Paul recognises that the Corinthians have been evangelising eloquently and wisely by

(1) Cf. Laberthonnière, (Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne. 3 (1906-07), pp. 75f.): "Ce n'est pas seulement un Christ ayant existé dont ils avaient chargé de transmettre le souvenir, c'est un Christ existant;...c'est le Christ présent qui vit en eux et en qui ils vivent." Fridrichsen (Jesus, St. John and St. Paul, pp. 58-62), following F.C. Baur and A. Schweitzer, sees an organic unity of Christ and his Church, the ground of this unity being the Lord himself but F. fails to make sufficiently clear that when Jesus' death and resurrection is preached his teaching also is set forth for the edification of the Church which feeds on him, that is on his teaching.

virtue of the grace given them by God καθὼς τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν, ὥστε ὑμᾶς μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι (I.1.6) but he is concerned to persuade them that the only true criterion is the gospel which Jesus himself preached,⁽¹⁾ the testimony whose authority lies within itself, resting on its own spiritual power.⁽²⁾ It is evident that even at this early date attempts have been made in Corinth to base authority on something or someone other than the Gospel itself and Paul refuses to play any part in this; he professes to have relied simply on the power of the truth of the message, the μαρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ (I.2.1).⁽³⁾ As in the Epistles to the Thessalonians so here Paul, associating with himself another co-worker, Sosthenes, uses the phrase μαρτύριον

(1) Zahn (Introduction, II, pp. 377ff., note 2) is correct in taking τοῦ Χριστοῦ (with Rev.1.9; 20.4) as subj. gen. The phrase τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ is certainly to be linked with ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ but the word of God, in the Biblical view, always has its source in God; it is his word to us rather than our word about him.

(2) "Καθὼς est difficile à traduire: il s'agit d'indiquer que la prédication de l'Evangile fut la cause de l'action de l'Esprit, mais aussi de rappeler que ses fruits ne seront authentiques que lorsque les Corinthiens se conformeront à l'Evangile." (Héring: La Première Epître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens, p. 16).

(3) Calvin (I Corinthians, p. 48): "I have no doubt that 'the testimony of God' is that which takes its origin in God, viz. the teaching of the Gospel, of which he is the Author and Witness." Bultmann (Theology of the New Testament, II, p. 105) discussing the development of the 'apostle' concept in the Church makes the curious statement: "The 'testimony' (μαρτύριον), which at first meant primarily an appeal as if by oath (I Thess.2.12: 'we charged you'), takes on more and more the meaning of 'attestation,' i.e. attestation of the facts experienced by the apostles as eye-witnesses, especially to the resurrection of Christ (Acts 1:22, 2:32, 3:15 etc.)." This can scarcely be sustained in view of Paul's use of the word-group elsewhere and that of the other Biblical writers.

τοῦ Χριστοῦ (I.1.6, cf. I.2.1: μαρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ⁽¹⁾
 in a context which echoes some significant OT passages and in
 this way he closely links, if he does not identify, the
 principles of the OT testimony with the NT gospel. ⁽²⁾

In II Esd.19.20f. the author writes: καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά σου
 τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἔδωκας συνετίσαι αὐτοὺς καὶ τὸ μαννα ⁽³⁾ σου οὐκ
 ἀφυστέρησας ἀπὸ στόματος αὐτῶν οὐχ ὑστέρησαν
 which corresponds to the giving of the grace of God to the
 Corinthians (I.1.4) as a gift of knowledge (I.1.5) and their
 not coming behind in any gift (μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι).
 The confirming of the testimony of Christ (I.1.6) bears a family
 resemblance to Ps.118.28,31: βεβαίωσόν με ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου...
 ἐκολλήθην τοῖς μαρτυρίαις σου where λόγος and μαρτύριον are
 used interchangeably. ⁽⁴⁾ That μαρτύριον is used here for

(1) See Weiss (Der Erster Korintherbrief, pp.45f.) for a note
 on the alternative reading μυστήριον in which W. favours
 μαρτύριον. The weight of evidence gives little indica-
 tion of the original reading (μαρτύριον in δ^c BDGpm] μυστήριον
 in p⁴⁶ δ^* A). Ultimately the meaning is the same, as may be
 gathered from Am.3.7 where the LXX translates $\tau\acute{\iota}\psi$ (= secret) by
 παιδεία which, in turn is equivalent to prophecy in v.8
 and is something which is testified (ἐπιμαρτύρασθαι) in
 v.13). In Prov.11.13 $\tau\acute{\iota}\psi$ is translated by βουλή; cf. also
 Mt.13.11 where μυστήριον refers to the teaching of Jesus'
 parables; I Cor.2.7 where it is related to σοφία (v.6) and I
 Cor.4.1 where it clearly means the testimony or teaching of the
 Spirit.

(2) See Friedrich (KWB. VI, 850.15 - 851.21) for a comparison of
 NT and OT prophets.

(3) Cf. I Cor.10.1-4; Jn.6.31-35.

(4) "βεβαίωσις denotes the positive or aggressive side, the
 direct advancement and establishment of the Gospel." (Lightfoot:
Philippians p. 85).

what is preached or taught finds support in Mk.16.20 where it is said that the Eleven went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them and confirming (βεβαιούντος) the word with signs following⁽¹⁾ and in Col.2.7 where Paul speaks of the Colossians being βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἔδιδάχθητε .

Having pointed out that God has dispensed with the wisdom of the world that no flesh should boast in his presence (I.1.29) and that Christ has become the Christian's wisdom that whoever boasts may boast in the Lord (I.1.30f.),⁽²⁾ Paul proceeds to show how he has modelled his own preaching on this principle: "And I brothers, when I came to you, did not come with a superabundance of word or wisdom, declaring to you the testimony of God (I.2.1)." He has stated that Christ apostled him not to baptise but to evangelise (I.1.17) but this commission invests him with no rights or privileges (I.2.3); his only authority, if it can be called his, lies in the spiritual power which is demonstrated when the word (or proclamation or testimony) is spoken. He does, however, claim to teach a kind of wisdom to those who have already been taught the gospel (τοῖς τελείοις) (I.2.6f.); this is the wisdom of God which is revealed or taught by the Holy Spirit to the spiritual man (ὁ πνευματικός) (I.2.15) who, as a result, searches out everything and "is not himself subject to judgement by his fellowmen" (NEB).⁽³⁾

Paul speaks here with the authority of the teacher who has received his doctrine as a spiritual gift whose truth is

(1) Cf. Ro.15.8; II Cor.1.21; Phil.1.7; Col.2.7; Heb.2.2f; 13.9.

(2) Dt.10.21.

(3) Grundmann (KWB.II.312) says that Paul as an apostle is not a teacher of wisdom but a witness of the cross of Christ but he fails to note that Paul is a teacher of the wisdom of God (I Cor. 2.7) and that he preaches Christ crucified (I Cor.1.23) who is the power and the wisdom of God (I Cor.1.24). G. sees rightly that the δύναμις of I Cor.1.24 refers to the content of the preaching and not to the form.

discerned by the spiritually-minded according to spiritual criteria. He, the πνευματικός has not been able to speak to the Corinthians as to πνευματικοί but has had to feed them with milk (I.3.1f.; cf. Is.28.9; Ps.19.7) because they are still thinking in terms of worldly wisdom and degrees of importance and not according to God's wisdom or testimony. He refers to his own unique place as the one who has laid the foundation of their faith, that is, the testimony, which is again referred to as a gift of grace (I.3.10).⁽¹⁾ No individual is more important than another in the Church since each Christian, once the foundation has been laid, is the heir to all things, therefore let no man glory in men (I.3.21ff.).

Paul wishes himself and other preachers and teachers to be regarded as ὑπηρετάι Χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκονόμοι μυστηρίων Θεοῦ (I.4.1).⁽²⁾ It is significant that, in the prologue to his Gospel, Luke describes his sources of information as οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρετάι . . . τοῦ λόγου (Lk.1.2) and that in Ac.26.16 the risen Lord in a vision appoints Paul ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα and sends him to the Gentiles to open their eyes etc., that is, to give them the true teaching about God. Ὑπηρέτης is always used in the LXX and the NT to denote a servant without any mention of authority or rank but the phrase οἰκονόμος μυστηρίων Θεοῦ brings the thought of the distribution of something committed as a charge and so is very appropriate as a title for a teacher. In Mt.13.11 the disciples are said to be given the knowledge of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven; in Lk.12.42 the Lord sets the faithful and wise steward as ruler over the

(1) Sass (Apostelamt und Kirche, p.53) on I Cor.3.10ff. notes: "Das 'pflanzen' und 'bauen' bezeichnet die erste Predigt in der Gemeinde."

(2) See Str/Bill. I, p. 659f. for examples of the whole oral tradition as a mystery which Israel is to retain and guard. Cf. Bornkamm, KWB. IV, 823, note 132.

household to give a portion of meat in due season - a clear reference to a teaching authority; in Ro.16.25 Paul equates his gospel and kerygma with 'the revelation of the mystery'; in Col.1.25 he speaks of being a *διάκονος* according to the stewardship of God given to him to fulfil the word of God. The important thing for the steward is that he be found faithful in his dealings with his master's property - in Paul's case, with the testimony entrusted to him. All God's stewards have been honoured with the same trust and no one has anything in respect of this which he has not received (I.4.7).

At this point a distinction has been made between the situation in Corinth as Paul thought it should be and the situation as it actually was. Already there are signs within the church of various people jockeying for the power which Paul and his fellow-ministers have renounced (I.4.6-14).⁽¹⁾ The apostle reverts in I.4.15 to the idea of his having laid the foundation of their Christian life; he describes himself as their father in contrast to their subsequent teachers who are only *παιδαγωγοί*.⁽²⁾ As their father he was under obligation to teach them the torah, now replaced by the gospel⁽³⁾ and he sends Timothy to them to remind them of his 'ways in Christ' as he teaches everywhere in every church (I.4.15-17).⁽⁴⁾

(1) Cf. Lindton (Theologische Studien und Kritiken 102(1930), p. 436).

(2) "The name carries with it an idea of severity (as of a stern censor and enforcer of morals)." (Grimm-Thayer: Lexicon p. 472b).

(3) Dt.4.9 etc.

(4) Cf. Michel (KWB.IV, 681): "Die apostolische Verkündigung ist nicht nur Erinnerung, sondern verlangt gleichfalls Erinnerung (11.21f.)...Wer die Gemeinde erinnert, bezeugt damit die Evangelium" (1.37). Riesenfeld's translation: "les cas où j'ai suivi 'la voie' en Jésus-Christ." (Stud. Theol.(1947/48), p.114), based on his conception of 'the way' as 'la voie de charité', does not take into account the close connection between 'torah' and 'way' and disregards the *διάσσω* of 4.17 and the fact that Timothy's faithfulness in Christ means his faithfulness to the teaching of Christ.

The full significance of II Cor.1.12 is appreciated when these words: Ἡ γὰρ καύχησις ἡμῶν αὕτη ἐστίν, τὸ μαετύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν are read in the light of the following OT passages: (1) Dt.10.21; οὗτος καύχημά σου καὶ οὗτος Θεός σου, ὅστις ἐποίησεν ἐν σοὶ τὰ μεγάλα καὶ τὰ ἔνδοξα ταῦτα, ἃ εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου. Parallel to this is Paul's reference to the thorn in the flesh (II Cor.12.7-9) the origin of which expression may well be in Num.33.55 where the heathen worshippers of false gods are described as σκόλοπες ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ βολίδες ἐν ταῖς πλευραῖς ὑμῶν (cf. Josh.23.13; Jud.2.3). In each case Paul's boasting is in the grace (i.e. the gospel) with which he has been entrusted, in which he walks and which he sets against the opposition of false teachers, prophets and apostles; (2) I K.2.10: μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ... ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχᾶσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα. (cf. Jer.9.23f.); and (3) Sir.39.1,3,8: Πλὴν τοῦ ἐπιδιδόντος τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ διανοουμένου ἐν νόμῳ ὑψίστου... ἐν αἰνίγμασι παραβολῶν ἀναστραφήσεται.... αὐτὸς ἐκφανεῖ παιδείαν διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν νόμῳ διαθήκης κυρίου καυχῆσεται. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the μαετύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν and the καύχησις were associated in Paul's mind with the gospel he preached "in simplicity and godly sincerity", which is the opposite of "fleshy wisdom" and is identified with God's grace, that is, God's wisdom.⁽¹⁾ It

(1) Cf. Eccles 10.12; λόγοι στόματος σοφοῦ χάρις. Similarly Prov.1.8f.; 3.3f.; 21f.; 4.8f.; Sap.8.21; 6.18; Sir. 21.16; 37.21.

has already been shown that *παράκλησις* is used to denote the gospel and so the charisma of II.1.11, referring to the same gospel, wisdom, torah etc., would be regarded as pointing back to the *παράκλησις* of II.1.3-7 and the *χάρις* of v.12. Thus Paul indicates that his authority, although it does not seek dominion over their faith, is a real thing and rests on his adherence to the *παράκλησις* which they have already acknowledged by faith and to which he has been adhering all his Christian life. This is in line with his thought in I Cor. chapters 1-4 with its scorn for the wisdom of the world which God has rendered foolish by his testimony. The testimony is a gift, freely given by God (II.1.11,15,22; cf. I.1.4, 2.10,12; 3.10; 4.7); it is the gospel,⁽¹⁾ a charisma which remains constant, it is the testimony of the apostle's *συνείδησις* and is also something that the Corinthians know well and have acknowledged. This interpretation of II.1.12 means that the *ὅτι* of this verse should be taken as a Causal Particle meaning 'for that', 'because', 'seeing that', 'inasmuch as'.⁽²⁾

The context of these *μαρτύριον* passages shows that Paul uses the word to denote the gospel along with many other synonyms,⁽³⁾ as the LXX does in respect of the torah. The Corinthians, like the Thessalonians before them, have heard the testimony and have responded to it in faith. That they themselves have now become witnesses in the sense of perpetrators of the testimony shows itself *ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει* (I.1.5). Paul asserts that he has been apostled in order to evangelise (I.1.17, cf. I.15.1), that is, to speak the word of

(1) Cf. I Tim.4.14.

(2) LS.p. 1265.B.a.

(3) Cf. Schniewind, *KWB*.I.69f.

the cross which is the power of God (I.1.18) and which is also called kerygma (I.1.21). In I.2.4 the testimony of God is referred to as ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου ; in I.3.2 the first delivery of the testimony is described as 'feeding with milk',⁽¹⁾ and the metaphor is changed in I.3.10 to that of laying a foundation and in I.9.11 to that of sowing seed. In I.9.21 Paul speaks explicitly of being subject to the law of God and the law of Christ, which law can be nothing else than the Christian torah, the gospel.

Further confirmation of this position is found in the Resurrection chapter of I Corinthians where Paul introduces the words ψευδομάρτυς and μαρτυρεῖν in connection with the proclamation of the apostolic message (the κηρύσσομεν of I.15.11 (cf. v.12) means the same as the ἑμαρτυρήσαμεν of v.15.⁽²⁾ Paul begins the chapter with the words: Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον which echo a thought in one of the Psalms: καὶ ἀνέστησεν μαρτύριον ἐν Ιακωβ καὶ νόμον ἔθετο ἐν Ἰσραὴλ, ὅσα ἐνετείλατο τοῖς πατέσιν ἡμῶν τοῦ γνωρίσαι αὐτὰ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτῶν (Ps.77.5). Then in v.15 he describes the apostles as witnesses who testify that God has raised Jesus, that is, who proclaim the gospel of the resurrection.⁽³⁾ In his polemic against those who deny the general resurrection he argues from the resurrection of Christ. As K. Barth says correctly.⁽⁴⁾ "(Paul) conjures up the cloud of witnesses not to confirm the fact of the resurrection of Jesusbut to confirm that the foundation of the Church.....can

(1) Cf. Is.28.9; 66.11.

(2) Cf. Reitzenstein, Hermes. 52(1917), p. 449.

(3) Cf. Friedrich, KWB.III. 707, note 51.

(4) The Resurrection of the Dead, pp. 150f.

be traced back to nothing else than the appearances of the living Christ." Barth discusses this point fully⁽¹⁾ and argues that the empty tomb is the only historical, visible, demonstrable reality and that it lies between the two undemonstrables, viz. "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures" and "he rose again the third day according to the scriptures" - "like an alpine hut in a deep valley between mountains 15,000 feet high." Bultmann, on the other hand,⁽²⁾ thinks that Paul is here attempting to "guarantee the resurrection of Christ as an objective fact by listing witnesses who had seen him risen". Bultmann, in a footnote,⁽³⁾ insists that the listing of witnesses has this meaning and that this is the primary meaning although it does not exclude Barth's view that one other purpose is to guarantee the identity of Paul's message with that of the earliest Jerusalem Church. It is clear, however, that Paul is seeking to establish the general resurrection and that he seeks to do this by reference to the appearances of Jesus to Cephas, the Twelve, the five hundred brethren,⁽⁴⁾

(1) Op. cit., pp. 137-156.

(2) Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 82; cf. p. 295 and II, p. 127, New Testament and Mythology, pp. 38-43.

(3) Op. cit., p. 295.

(4) Holl (Ges. Aufs. II, p. 51) says that 'the over five hundred brethren "durch ihre Vision wohl μαρτυρες geworden, aber nicht ἀπόστολοι" but they are surely to be included in the αὐτῶν πάντων of I Cor. 15.10 and in the ἐκεῖνοι and κηρύσσοντες of v. 11 and the ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν of v. 15. Holl speaks of the μαρτυρ being made an apostle through a commission from Christ - "ein Amt der Verkündigung" (p. 52) but according to Ac. 22.14f. Paul's commissioning includes his becoming (ἐσθ) a μαρτυρ; and this is also true for Matthias (Ac. 1.22: μαρτυρα ... γενέσθαι) and even for the Eleven (Ac. 1.8: ἐσθσθέ μου μαρτυρες); in Lk. 24.28 there is no verb to indicate but the reference, in view of Ac. 1.8, must be to the future. Cf. Rengstorff (Auferstehung, p. 141, note 23) who says that Holl's attempt to distinguish between apostle and μαρτυρ must be regarded as untenable.

James, all the apostles⁽¹⁾ and, finally, himself⁽²⁾ and yet the argument in the verses which follow is curiously circular and conveys the impression that for Paul the resurrection of Christ depends on the general resurrection and the general resurrection depends on the resurrection of Christ. In v.12 Paul bases the general resurrection on the preaching of the rising of Christ from the dead and then he proceeds to state three times (vv.13,15 and 16) that the raising of Christ depends on the reality of the general resurrection. It is impossible to enter here into a discussion as to what exactly was seen by the people who are said to have seen Christ after he rose again but Paul in vv.43-45 describes the resurrection body as being raised "in glory" and "in power" and as being "a spiritual body" and "a life-giving spirit". Thus it looks very much as if $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\acute{\nu}\eta\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$ do not refer to the act of seeing in any material sense but to the act of proclaiming.⁽³⁾ Certainly the apostles would be false witnesses if Christ had not in some real way been raised from the dead, that is to say, if their vision had been a false vision like that of the false prophets condemned by Jeremiah (Jer.14.14;

(1) This must mean 'all the apostles sent by Jesus', that is the Twelve (Eleven) and the Seventy. Holl (Ges. Aufs. II, pp. 47-49) points out that the $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ denotes a closed circle and does not refer, as Lightfoot has it, to a broader circle of missionaries but he is surely wrong in confining them to James and the Twelve.

(2) Cf. Corssen (NJKA. 37(1916), p. 424.1): "Alle diese sind also Zeugen der Auferstehung Christi, und ihr Zeugnis beweist die Wahrheit des Evangeliums." This is true, but only to those to whom the Holy Spirit also testifies; it is a spiritual "proof", or rather, evidence, for a spiritual event. Note also Corssen's appreciation of the fact that it has to contend with false teaching.

(3) Holl (Ges. Aufs. II, p. 70) links the witnesses of v.15 with the people at the beginning of the chapter who have 'seen' the risen Christ. Reitzenstein rightly objects to this (Hermes. 52 (1917), pp. 450f.), having stated (p.449) that the phrase $\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ τοῦ Θεοῦ "charakterisiert die Haupttätigkeit des Sendboten Gottes, die feierliche Verkündigung." Gerhardsson (Memory and

(1)
23.25f.) but to say with M. Barth that "Die objektive Tatsächlichkeit des Bezeugten und die Gegenwart der Apostel bei dem bezeugten Ereignis ist daher der Grund für die Echtheit der apostolischen Zeugenschaft und für die Wahrheit ihres Zeugnisses" and that the Revelation of God is "historische Tatsache" is to deny that it is necessary for faith to 'see' the revelation in and through the historical event. It was not just in the event of the resurrection that the disciples 'saw' Jesus' glory as though this 'seeing' was confined to a sort of supernatural event; John declares that while he lived among men they received him and believed in his name (Jn. 1.14, 12).

Whether the testimony is to historical fact or to something trans-historical⁽²⁾ its subject-matter is certainly the basis of Paul's claim that he and the other apostles are authoritative preachers and teachers, that they are true and faithful witnesses and not false witnesses. Strathmann⁽³⁾ observes correctly: "ψευδομαρτυρῶν den bezeichnet, der als Zeuge, dh. unter Berufung darauf, dass er Zeuge ist, etwas Falsches aussagt.... Das Interesse der Bemerkung haftet also an dem Inhalt des Zeugnisses. Holl,⁽⁴⁾ concerned to demonstrate the leading place of the Jerusalem community, calls this tradition "die sozusagen amtliche Darstellung der Urgemeinde" but Paul will not admit that he must submit to the leaders in Jerusalem - he will submit only to the Lord, to the testimony itself which is his (Ro.2.16),

Manuscript pp. 280f.) gives as the two essential bases of the actual message of I Cor.15.3ff. (i) that Christ's Apostles, in the widest meaning of the term, are eye-witnesses. (ii) that the Scriptures confirm the 'truth' (reliability) of the course of events described."

(1) Der Augenzeuge, p. 275.

(2) Cf. Smith (The Book of the Twelve Prophets, II, p. 139): "A vision is something realised, experienced."

(3) KWB IV. 520.5f.

(4) Ges Aufs. II, p. 46.

as well as theirs. Holl's reference⁽¹⁾ to Paul's submission to James (Ac.21.18ff.) is answered before the event by Paul himself who because of his submission to the gospel and in order that he may share it with others has become all things to all men although he is ἐλεύθερος ἐκ πάντων (I Cor.9.19). Holl's separating of Tradition and Charisma⁽²⁾ is based on his misconception of the witness-concept as legal eye-witness rather than as bearer of the testimony of God or Christ.

M. Barth,⁽³⁾ in reply to Strathmann's contention⁽⁴⁾ that Paul is not an eye-witness in the same sense as the Twelve, says: "Ist es aber nicht die Art und Dauer, sondern der Gegenstand des Sehens, ist es die Erscheinung der Auferstandenen, deren Anblick Voraussetzung für den Apostolat ist, so ist Paulus die Eigenschaft, Augenzeuge zu sein, nicht abzusprechen." By this way of arguing and by his distinguishing between "der tatsächliche Zeuge" and "der bekennende Zeuge"⁽⁵⁾ Barth allows on the one hand what he disallows on the other. When he speaks of the Twelve alone he stresses the eye-witnessing of the facts of the incarnate one, when he speaks of them together with Paul he soft-pedals this aspect and stresses the fact of their eye-witnessing of the resurrection. Barth's final argument in this note is that Paul would not have been so sure of his equality with those who were apostles before him had not he, as well as Peter, regarded this eye-witnessing as essential for his apostolate. This is true but the real question is: "Was Paul's witnessing like that of the Twelve or was the witnessing

(1) Op. cit., p. 49.

(2) Op. cit., p. 51.

(3) Der Augenzeuge, pp. 355f., note 4, cf. Allo: Première Epître aux Corinthiens, p. 395.

(4) KWB IV, 497.31ff.

(5) Der Augenzeuge, pp. 273-285.

of the Twelve like that of Paul?" It is astonishing that so many scholars take μάρτυς to mean eye-witness when the term and its cognates are used so often in the LXX for prophet and preaching, teacher and teaching.

There is only one count on which Paul will admit a weakness in his claim to apostolic status and that is his anti-church activity prior to his conversion. He is the least of the apostles and not fit to be called an apostle not because he is an incompetent witness but because of his past life (I.15.9). But against this factor he sets the grace of God which, he claims, has not been given to him in vain (I.15.10). Linking this with v.3 we find another hint that the gospel is the bearer of the grace if not the grace-gift itself.⁽¹⁾ Besides the grace-gift Paul speaks of its complement, viz. the labour (ἐκοπίασα) of preaching or testifying - the words have the same meaning for Paul (I.15.10,15). Together the gift of grace and the exercise of it establish Paul's position in apostolic company. The apostolic testimony was regarded by Paul as being the content of the revelation; that which he received he received through a revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal. 1.12). Paul admits in I.15.14 that if Christ has not been raised his preaching and the faith of the Corinthians are both empty, that is to say that his authority stands or falls with the truth of his gospel and this is true for all the apostles whose preaching was identical with that of Paul I.15.11; cf. Gal.2.6).

(1) χάρις is frequently used by Paul as a synonym for χάρισμα e.g. Ro.1.5; 12.3,6; 15.15; I Cor.1.4; 3.10; Gal.2.9; Eph.3.2,7f; cf. I Pet.4.10. When I Cor.15.10 is set alongside v.14 it is seen that Paul's κήρυγμα and 'the grace given to him' are one and the same.

It is significant that Paul in stating the consequences of the hypothesis of Christ's not having been raised mentions first the emptiness of the apostolic preaching; then follows, apparently as a consequence of that, the futility of the Corinthians' faith and finally the unmasking of the apostles as false witnesses. If the testimony of the Resurrection of Christ is to be regarded as simply eye-witness testimony the natural sequence would surely have been for v.14 to follow v.15. The grace-gift of the gospel or kerygma which related the events of Jesus' life, death and resurrection to man's salvation was opposed in Corinth by another doctrine, viz. that there is no general resurrection; this opposition was provided by people who apparently did not deny the resurrection of Christ (15.12, 16,19). What Paul is trying to show here is not Christ's resurrection but the general resurrection. There can be eye-witness testimony, of a sort, to Jesus' resurrection but this could not be called the gospel, just as "Christ died" can have eye-witness testimony but "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures" cannot for it is a statement of faith which may or may not be *κενή*. The false doctrine in Corinth is one which cannot be disproved by eye-witnesses of some kind of resurrection of Jesus who could only prove (?) something about Jesus, not about the destiny of those who believe in him. It is significant that Paul does not say in defence of the traditional doctrine (15.12) "if Christ has risen" but "if Christ is proclaimed to have risen" and the first consequence is that the kerygma is vain, the faith is vain, not that the witnesses are false. *Ψευδομαρτυρος* in v.15 must mean false prophet, or false teacher. To be a "false-witness of God" and to "testify against God" are certainly very clumsy phrases if Paul only means to indicate that he and the other apostles did not really

see the risen Christ but they are understandable if viewed in the light of the prophetic witness (with which the *μαρτυς* - group has been shown to be concerned⁽¹⁾) and the opponents of the prophets, the false prophets.

The phrase: *ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις* is used in II.3.7f. to describe the OT law in contrast to *ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος* which is the NT testimony, the message of the new covenant of which Paul and Timothy are *διάκονοι* (II.3.6).⁽²⁾ This ministry is a matter of manifesting the truth (II.4.2) which is Christ who bears the light of the knowledge of the glory of God (II.4.6). II.5.20 provides an illustration of Paul's use of *παρακαλεῖν* as the function of the deacons,⁽³⁾ viz. to appeal to people to turn to God by the preaching of the word; this was the function of the OT prophet by which he became a fellow-worker with God (II.6.1; cf. Ro.1.12f.). It may be claimed that the above passages give good grounds for holding that Paul regarded himself as the bearer of a testimony which can be described in many ways and which is the fulfilment of the prophetic testimony of the OT,⁽⁴⁾ the new torah of Jesus; it is the *μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (I.1.6) or *τοῦ Θεοῦ* (I.2.1).⁽⁵⁾

(1) Schweizer (Church Order, 5k) identifies prophet and teacher.

(2) Cf. II Cor.5.18.

(3) Here ambassadors who have the *διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς*.

(4) See Rengstorff (Apostleship, pp. 21-24) for Rabbinic references to Moses, Elijah, Elisha and Ezekiel as *Sh'luhim* "since through them things happened which elsewhere are reserved for God." (p.22). R. fails to relate this to Jesus' promise to his apostles in Jn. 14.12 and says that the Rabbis never regard a prophet as a *shali'h* of God. This may be true but it does not necessarily follow that Jesus took up the same attitude to the prophets.

(5) Greeven (ZNW.44(1952/53), pp. 18-23) reckons that certain verses (e.g. Col.1.28; 3.16; 2.7) would seem to justify the opinion that, in contrast to the complete salvation preaching, teaching has to do with what is called admonition or exhortation, equivalent to the Hebrew *נְדָבָה* but he shows that in Gal.1,12 the gospel is expressly named as the subject of the *διδάχη* and II Thess. 2.15 supports the view that teaching has to do with Tradition-

The Content of the Testimony

The testimony to which Paul refers in I Cor. has the usual content: (a) It concerns the Kingdom of God (4.20; cf. II Thess.1.5; 6.9f; 15.24), the God whose wisdom, which was before the world (2.7), destroys the wisdom of the wise (1.19); he is the real and true God who is contrasted with the idols (8.1-6; 10.21,26). (b) God's moral imperative is referred to in 6.9f., 14-20; 11.29; 12.13 - 13.8; 15.33f; 16.14. (c) The Corinthians have been washed, sanctified and justified (6.11); they have been bought with a price (7.23); that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures is part of the tradition which Paul received and delivered (15.3). (d) The saints shall judge the world (6.2) and the future hope is founded on the raising of Jesus by God (6.14; 15.4; 19-28,51-57). All four aspects of the testimony are found within the compass of each of two passages, viz. 6.9-14 and 15.1-58. II Cor. also has two passages which set forth the four-fold content, viz. 4.1-18: (a) v.6; (b) v.2; (c) v.10; (d) vv.14,17 and 6.1-18; (a) v.16; (b) v.3; (c) v.2; (d) vv.17f.

The Authority of the Witnesses

In Corinth already there has begun a struggle for superiority in the Church; different parties are opposing one another under different apostolic names but Paul asserts that his own loyalty is to Christ (1.1.12), inferring that the others should follow his example in this. In the early chapters of I Cor. Paul insists that his authority lies in the power of God and in the teaching of the Holy Spirit shown in the gospel, not in any personal attributes. He insists that Apollos and himself are nothing in themselves by virtue either of a direct commission from the Lord or of their receiving a commission from the Church; they are simply δῆκονοι through whose

material. - "Prophetie und Lehre sind einander zugeordnet." (pp.28f.).

ministrations the Corinthians came to believe - and even the faith is God's gift (I.3.5). Paul himself has laid the foundation and Apollos has built on it but no one should glory in men; only in God. The apostles are to be regarded as ὑπηρεῖται Χριστοῦ and οἰκονόμοι μυστηρίων ⁽¹⁾ Θεοῦ (I.4.1); thus Paul equates himself with those who were "eye-witnesses and ministers from the beginning" ⁽²⁾ and with the faithful and wise steward of whom Jesus spoke, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household to give the measure of food in due season (Lk.12.42). Paul adds significantly in I.4.2 that they should be found faithful, that is, faithful witnesses.

Paul's authority is being questioned in Corinth but on the grounds that he has begotten them through the gospel he beseeches the Corinthians to imitate him in the ways that he teaches in every church. The fact that he threatens to come with a rod does not justify the assumption that Paul holds an official position or authority over them. ⁽³⁾ His authority lies in the truth of "his" ways ⁽⁴⁾ which he teaches everywhere (I.4.17) and which are the same as those of Peter, James and John. ⁽⁵⁾ I.7.6,

(1) Cf. I Cor.9.17. "i.e. teachers of the revealed truths." (Lightfoot. Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, p. 197; cf. Job 29.4; Ps.24.14; Prov.3.32.

(2) Cf. Lk.1.2; Ac.26.16.

(3) The rod is that of the schoolmaster; cf. Schneider: KWB VI, 968. 20-28.

(4) Cf. Holl (Ges. Aufs. II p. 64): "nie schlechthin durch Auktorität sondern immer nur zugleich durch Gründe."

(5) Gal.2.2. When Reid (The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry, p. 34) speaks of Paul being a witness to the risen Christ this is perhaps not quite the NT nuance, rather are the witnesses witnesses of Christ, i.e. the witnesses he uses to bear his testimony.

10,12 and 25 show that Paul has had access to a tradition of Jesus' ethical teaching as well as to what has been known as the kerygma; it is this which he uses as his criterion and not a claim to an official position⁽¹⁾ and where there are gaps in his knowledge he claims to be faithful to the spirit of what he does know (I.7.25; cf. v.40).

When Paul defends his apostleship in I Cor. 9 he declares that he has seen Jesus⁽²⁾ but the seal of his apostleship⁽³⁾ is the Corinthian church itself, the result of his testifying and he mentions no special commission at this point. He certainly admits that he has been entrusted with οἰκονομία but this does not necessarily refer to an official status.⁽⁴⁾ As in II Thess. Paul mentions his authority (ἐξουσία)⁽⁵⁾ to demand hospitality when he is on the Lord's business and which he renounces in order that he may never be charged with abusing his authority which is in the gospel; whatever happens its authority must not be undermined.

That τῶν πνευματικῶν in I.12.1 is masculine (pneumatics) rather than neuter (spiritual gifts) is clear from v.3 which contains a simple formula for testing the believer. Paul is concerned in this passage to demonstrate the unity of the body

(1) Cf. v. Campenhausen (KA und GV) pp. 52f.

(2) With SAB. Davies (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 195) is to be agreed with when he says that κατὰ σάρα in II Cor.5.16 should be taken with οἶδαμεν and quotes Rawlinson (The New Testament Doctrine of Christ p. 90, note 5): "For Paul there is only one Christ, Jesus of Nazareth. What he is repudiating is not a fleshly kind of Christ but a fleshly kind of knowledge!"

(3) In spite of the fact that Paul rests his case on the result of his teaching, M. Barth (Der Augenzeuge, p. 167) avers: "Paulus begründet das Recht seines Apostelnamens und seines Wirkens als Apostel Jesu Christi mit dem Hinweis nicht nur auf den Erfolg seines Wirkens sondern auch und primär mit dem Hinweis auf seine Augenzeugenschaft."

(4) Cf. v. Campenhausen, Stud. Theol. (1947/48), p. 114.

(5) Derived from the testimony of Jesus (Lk.10.8).

of Christ; all Christians are indwelt by the one Spirit; no member is more important than another. Any attempt to show from Paul's lists of workers and charisms that a hierarchy existed in the NT Church⁽¹⁾ must end unsatisfactorily⁽²⁾ for even within I Cor. 12 there is no strict correspondence between the list in vv. 8-10 and that in v. 28. For example, prophecy which comes second in v. 28 is sixth in vv. 8-10. In the four lists in I Cor. 12; Ro. 12.6-8 and Eph. 4.11 out of all the functions (which may be reduced to twenty-two in number, viz. ⁽³⁾ ἀποστόλοι, προφῆται, διδασκάλαι,

(1) Brosch (Charismen und Ämter in der Urkirche p. 43) agrees, but with the exception, of course, of the Twelve Apostles! and (p. 44) the further exception of Paul and Barnabas who were specially sent out by the Holy Spirit. Brosch's attempts to discredit the so-called 'enthusiastic charismatics', including the prophets, rest on a misreading of texts, e.g. he speaks (p. 46) of the continuing tension between the organised Church and the charismatics and (p. 84) of the "gesunde Misstrauen der Kirche gegen den Prophetismus, wie vor allem die Didache (11) und die Briefe des hl. Ignatius (Ad. Mag. 8) von Antiochien lehren". This may be true of the Church in the second century but it is certainly not true of the NT Church. In any case Did. 11 is concerned not with prophecy as such but with false prophets who teach ἀλλήν διδασχῆν εἰς τὸ καταλῦσαι and in Ig. Ad. Mag. 8 there is no statement which merits Brosch's quoting it. Against B's view is to be set the standing indication of the weakness of any view of institutional apostleship, viz. the case of Judas, and the words of Jesus concerning prophesying by the Twelve (Mt. 10.40f., 23.34). Brosch is correct in saying (p. 165) that the apostles, prophets and teachers belong in no way to the church hierarchy, because no such hierarchy existed! B. is correct also when he says: "Nicht um den judaistischen Zerschneiden des Evangeliums, sondern auch den Charismatikern galt darum das Anathem, wenn sie als Norm für ihre Verkündigung nicht das ordentliche Lehramt, wie es durch die Apostel vertreten war, nahmen" but Paul's τίς in Gal. 1.9 undoubtedly includes the apostles too, and the apostle to the Gentiles also shows in Gal. 2.11-14 that even Peter can make a mistake in his teaching.

(2) Cf. Dix, The Apostolic Ministry, p. 239; Schweizer (Church Order, 7k): "The enumerations of the different kinds of gifts are quite unsystematic, with no sort of hierarchical character".

(3) Sohm (Kirchenrecht, pp. 45ff.) distinguishes between prophets and teachers in that the latter lack the special prophetic-gift

δυνάμεις, χαρίσματα, ⁽¹⁾ἰαμάτων, ἀντιλήψεις,
 κυβερνήσεις, ⁽²⁾γένη γλωσσῶν, (cf. Ac.2),
 διερμηνεύοντες, εὐαγγελίσται, ποιμένες,
 διακονία, ὁ παρακαλῶν, ὁ μεταδίδους, ὁ προΐστάμενος
 (cf. I Thess 5.12), ὁ ἐλεῶν, ἀγάπη, λόγος σοφίας,
λόγος γνώσεως, πίστις, διακρίσεις πνευμάτων (cf.
 I.14.29)) fourteen (underlined above) ⁽³⁾ are concerned with the
 imparting of the gospel in one way or another but there is no
 fast relationship between the order of the words and the
 importance of the function; ⁽⁴⁾ for example, love, which Paul
 regards as the indispensable gift comes at the end of the list
 in Corinthians and in the list in Romans διακονία comes
 between prophecy and teaching. Brosch, ⁽⁵⁾ presenting the

"die Gabe des Geistesrede" but if, behind the testimony of men,
 there lies the testimony of the Holy Spirit then the teacher also
 may surely claim to have the gift of spiritual speech.
 Greeven (ZNW. 44(1952/53), p. 42, note 102) says that since the
 teachers are bearers of the Spirit "dürfte eine Unterscheidung
 für die Gemeinden von diesem Gesichtspunkt her praktisch
 undurchführbar gewesen sein."

(1) Cf. Prov.1.5 and Greeven (Op. cit., p. 31): "im Begriff des
 Steuermanns wie des Staatslenkers das Moment der Sachkunde
 mitgegeben ist."

(2) See below p. 339, note 2.

(3) Perhaps to these may be added revelation (I Cor. 14.26) and
 the singing of poems - a form of teaching in those days; cf.
 Filson (JBL. LX (1941), p. 327): "It is a possibility that some
 of the poetic forms in which Jesus' teaching is preserved is due
 to the teachers who recognised the effectiveness of teaching thus
 stated in parallelism."

(4) Cf. Brosch who presents the Roman view of the connection
 between charism and office in Charismen und Ämter, pp. 25ff.

(5) Op. cit., p. 42.

Roman Catholic view, would sharply divide the charismatic apostolic organisation founded by Jesus Christ himself from what he styles the "überschwenglichen Erweisen des Geistes, der neben den 'Zwölf' noch andere 'Apostel' in Fülle aussandte" but this follows from the one-sided interpretation of Mt.16.18f. divorced from other NT evidence. Gore,⁽¹⁾ on the other hand, considers that "the apostolic office must be taken to include Apostles, Prophets and Teachers. They together form the general ministry" that is, the one engaged in the preaching of the gospel. Mason⁽²⁾ takes the view that "in the primitive Church the antithesis between a charismatic and a non-charismatic ministry is a false one."

In I.12.8-10 the teaching gifts which have to do with the building-up of the Church are mentioned first⁽³⁾ and this is also the case in 12.28f. (cf. Ro. 12.6-8; Eph. 4.11f.)⁽⁴⁾ and Paul, in stating his preference for prophecy over tongues underlines the importance of teaching⁽⁵⁾ in the life of the Church. The prophet is 'greater' than the man who speaks with tongues for he edifies and exhorts and comforts⁽⁶⁾ but there is no

(1) The Expositor, Ser. 3 Vol. 5. p. 415-417.

(2) Conceptions of the Church in Early Times, p. 30.

(3) Προφητεία in v. 10 may mean 'foretelling' as in Ac. 11.28; 21.10f.

(4) Although κυβέβνησις, which has a connection with teaching, (cf. Prov. 1.5; 11.14; 12.5; IV Macc.7.1-3, Sap.10.4) comes lower down in the list, Beyer (KWB, III.1035.30-45) considers that the proclamation of the word was not the function of these church-leaders; but this would be difficult to defend in view of the fact that the wisdom in Prov.1.5 and the εὐσεβεία of IV Macc.7.1-3 refer to the torah of God. To confine proclamation to those only who have been given the title of apostle, prophet or teacher is to disregard many other passages in the NT which show a different state of affairs e.g. Ac.20.28; 6.10; I Cor.14.26; I Thess.1.8 etc.

(5) I Cor.14.6,19.

(6) Cf. Is.50.4: Κύριος δίδωσίν μοι γλῶσσαν παιδείας τοῦ γνῶναι ἐν καιρῷ ἥνικα δεῖ εἰπεῖν λόγον.

indication of the prophet having official status in the congregation⁽¹⁾ and there are no degrees of rank since at the meeting two or three of the prophets are to speak and others are to examine what they say;⁽²⁾ all are capable of prophesying (I.14.31)⁽³⁾ and teaching⁽⁴⁾ so that all may learn and be comforted, but they must give way to one another (I.14.32; cf. Ro. 12.10; Eph. 5.21; Phil. 2.3; I Pet. 5.5). In order to substantiate his authority for what he has to say about the prophets Paul has recourse to the tradition of Jesus' teaching already referred to (I.14.37) and he concludes the chapter with a plea for seemliness and orderliness at the meetings, a request which shows that in Paul's view a pneumatic need not necessarily

(1) Cf. Brosch (Charismen und Ämter in der Urkirche, pp. 111-119; p. 121, note 447 and p. 122) who distinguishes between the members of Ro.12.8 and Eph. 4.11 (the so-called non-official charismatics) from the *πρωτοστάμενοι* of I Thess. 5.12 who are charismatics "die allerdings in dem Augenblick autoritativen Charakter bekommen und damit auch Amtscharakter, wo sie von dem Apostel oder von einem von diesen Beauftragten offiziell mit der Leitung der Gemeinde betraut werden." Lindsay (The Church and the Ministry, pp. 95f.) says well: "There is nothing in the whole series of descriptions of prophecy which have come down to us from apostolic and from sub-apostolic times to suggest that the prophets held any office - but they possessed the very great authority of those who are believed to utter the word of God." Cf. Robinson: The Christian Ministry, pp. 61-68.

(2) V. Campenhausen (KA und GV, pp. 68f.): "Die Vollmacht oder 'Autorität' die sie (the prophets) ausüben, ist....keine 'absolute' Autorität." and this is true of their testimony whose authenticity has to be tested since their prophecy is an interpretation or exposition of the basic testimony and must be shown to be fully in line with it.

(3) Cf. Greeven (ZNW, 44(1952/53), pp. 5-8) who points to traces of the special leading position of prophets in the beginning of a process in which the prophetic status of a few takes the place of an ability to prophesy on the part of the whole Church.

(4) All the activities mentioned in 14.26 have to do with teaching, even the singing of psalms; cf. The Song of Moses (Dt. Chaps. 30-32).

be, in fact ought not to be an ecstatic.⁽¹⁾ Paul indeed distinguishes between prophets and teachers (I.12.28) but the functions of each are almost indistinguishable for prophesying involves edifying or teaching (I.14.3f., 19,31) and the teacher is just as much a charismatic as the prophet.⁽²⁾

(1) It is no more likely that Paul is speaking of ecstasies than of false teachers when he refers to 'those who walk disorderly and not after the tradition' in II Thess.3.6. See also K. Barth, (The Epistle to the Romans, p. 298) on Ro. 8.16: "The Spirit is neither rational nor irrational but is the Logos..... Ecstasies and illuminations, inspirations and intuitions are not necessary". Greeven (ZNW. 44(1952/53) p. 8) on I Cor. 14.37 denies the ecstatic character of the prophet: "Das Prophet-Sein kann nicht im Sinne einer gelegentlichen, von einem zum andern wechselnden Ekstase, sondern muss als stetige, bei ihrem Träger bleibende Befähigung verstanden sein, die sich von Fall zu Fall in der prophetischen Rede äussert." Cf. Schlatter: The Church in the New Testament Period, pp. 22f. Farrer, representing the 'Catholic' standpoint, can say: "the prophet has no authority outside his ecstasy" (The Apostolic Ministry, ed. Kirk, p. 145) and distinguishes between ἐπίσκοποι and charismatics (pp. 145f.) in spite of Ac.20.28 which states explicitly that the Holy Spirit has made the Ephesian elders ἐπίσκοπους to teach the Church. When Farrer says (p. 146) that the charismatics are recognised in I Thess. but that they are not in control, this rests on the assumption that the spiritual prophets (5.19f.) (of whom Paul later writes: "He that prophesies speaks to men οἰκοδομῶν καὶ παρακλήσιν καὶ παραμυθίαν (I. Cor.14.3)) have nothing to do with the προϊστάμενοι of 5.12 whose only function, apparently, is (i) κοπιᾶν = 'to labour in teaching and edifying (cf. I Cor. 15.10; 16.16; I Tim. 5.17). It is applied to three women in Ro. 16.12!!! although this, admittedly, cannot refer to teaching; see especially Is. 49.4 where κοπιᾶν is used for the work of the prophet and (ii) νοουθετεῖν, a word used with reference to the mutual edification in spiritual songs of the congregation at Colosse (Col.3.16) and to the reprimanding authority allowed to 'the brethren' in Thessalonica (II Thess.3.15). Farrer who says (p. 147) of Stephanas' presidency that it "is based certainly not on charismata but on hard work" fails to define the type of work! - it is more than likely that it would be the work of preaching and teaching.

(2) Cf. Greeven, ZNW. 44(1952/53), p. 17. Dodd (The Johannine Epistles, p. 97) speaks of "the rational and intelligible inspiration of prophecy."

When Paul is asking the Corinthians to pay due respect to Timothy he cites in support of his request the fact that the young man works the works of the Lord (I.16.10); it is the work of the Lord, the preaching and teaching of the word which gives Timothy his authority.⁽¹⁾ Even the authority of Paul does not give him any jurisdiction over the activities of other preachers; he cannot insist that Apollos should visit Corinth, he can only exhort (I.16.12) and Apollos follows his own inclination in this matter. In the same way Paul exhorts the Corinthians to submit themselves to and acknowledge people like the family of Stephanas who apparently are the hosts of a congregation and who as such have undertaken διακονία for the saints.⁽²⁾ Here again the leaders of the Church are seen to be those who are engaged in teaching,⁽³⁾ who help with the apostles and labour (I.16.16).⁽⁴⁾ That the authority of Paul and the other witnesses is prophetic, that Paul himself is a prophet forth-telling the word of God is clear from his statements in I Cor.14. In v.6 he instances the possibility of his coming to Corinth speaking with tongues and prophesying or teaching and since he actually professes to speak with tongues more than any of them

(1) Sohm (Kirchenrecht, p. 109): "Die Lehrgabe genießt den ersten Rang in der Christenheit." In fact, Sohm sees the Lehrgabe at the foundation of every position of authority in the NT Church (pp. 28-38). Cf. II Cor. 7.15 and 9.13.

(2) Cf. I Clem. 42.4.

(3) "The host of such a group (the early house-church) was almost inevitably a man of some education." (JBL, LVIII (1939), pp. 111f.)

(4) Greeven (ZNW, 44 (1952/53) pp. 35f.) shows from I Cor. 5 and 6.1ff. that the leadership in Corinth was in the hands of the σόφαι, the teachers - even in matters of litigation; cf. p. 42: "Es werden ^{keine} leitenden Autoritäten sichtbar, deren Aufgaben abseits von Prophetie oder Lehre lägen"

it is most likely that he could claim the same for his prophesying and this is borne out by v.19⁽¹⁾.

In II Cor. Paul denies that his authority rests on "fleshly wisdom" and that he has any jurisdiction over the faith of other Christians (II.1.24). The Corinthians have believed his gospel, of which he is the apostle by God's will and what he is saying in this letter is only a repetition of what they know well and have already acknowledged (II.1.13); that is to say, Paul bases his authority on the gospel to which the Corinthians have entrusted themselves. Paul has written a previous letter to put their obedience to the proof but the general tenor suggests that the obedience is to the gospel.⁽²⁾ In chapter 3 he ridicules the thought of having to produce a testimonial to prove his and his companions' right to speak as they do to the church in Corinth; their own experience of his preaching should be sufficient to convince them of this and Paul brings forward no other reason. His authority lies in the διακονία πνεύματος (II.3.6)⁽³⁾ and the διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης, II.3.9; cf. 5.18: διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς), that is, the gospel or testimony, which is contrasted with the ministry of the letter of the law apart from grace. Having received this

(1) Sasse (Jesus Christ the Lord, p. 97) nevertheless says: "The disciples were not prophets, nor was Paul a prophet....the apostolic office is quite distinct from the prophetic office." The disciples may not be called prophets explicitly but they were chosen by Jesus to perform a prophet's task and he foretold for them the authentic prophet's persecution (Mt.5.12). Sasse sees the conflict between 'office' and 'spirit' as being to a large extent the conflict between the apostolate and prophecy (p. 98). This is because he seems to regard prophecy as being essentially a form of ecstasy although the OT has many examples of prophets who were matter-of-fact people and who disclaimed the ecstatic.

(2) Cf. II Cor. 9.13; 10.5.

(3) I.e. the new covenant. In the OT covenant and law are both equated with the testimony. See above p. 18, notes 1 and 2. and p. 19, and notes 1 and 2.

ministry, that is, the work of preaching the gospel, the apostles have set forth the truth but their authority depends on the response of the hearer's conscience (II.4.2). Paul and the other evangelists are merely the clay vessels which carry the treasure of the knowledge of the glory of God (II.4.7; cf. Is. 33.6; Jer. 39.10-14; Mt. 13.52);⁽¹⁾ they walk by faith and not by sight but the ministry is something which they have (II.4.1), something which remains; it is something which has been given to them (II.5.18); the word of reconciliation has been put in them (II.5.19). Their ambassadorial position is grounded on the message they bear rather than on the signs of the commission they claim to have received from God.⁽²⁾ "Für

(1) Cf. Denney, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, pp. 158-160 and note the possible allusion to Jer.39 where the book of the purchase is sealed and witnessed and put in an earthen vessel (ὁστέακις) (v.14). In the Heb. the book is called 'the purchase deeds', 'the sealed document' (Moffatt). Eph. 1.13f. may also point to this idea. Note also Jesus' comparing the kingdom of heaven to a treasure hidden in a field (Mt.13.44) and his telling the disciples that the kingdom is within them (Lk.17.21). Cf also IV Ezra: above p. 93.

(2) Cf. Bornkamm, KWB, VI, 681.36 - 682.34. It is significant that חֲזַן the participle of the Hiphil of חָזַן means 'interpreter'; it is translated as 'interpreter' in Gen.42.23(AV) (LXX: ἑρμηνευτής); cf. Lk.24.27 = καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, and I Cor.12.30. It is translated 'teacher' in Is.43.27 (AV) (LXX: ἄρχοντες) and 'ambassador' in II Chron. 32.31 (AV) (LXX: πρεσβύτερος). In Job 33.23 there is reference made to the messenger, interpreter (חֲזַן) (LXX: ἀγγελος θανατηφόρος - a curious translation), probably the teaching-priest of Mal.2.7, whose duty it is to show a man the way of uprightness and so find atonement for him. Cf. Mowinkel (ZNW, 32(1933), pp. 105ff.): "Die Aufgabe des Verwarnens, Überzeugens (ἐλεγχος) liegt auch im Hebräischen innerhalb der Tätigkeit eines mēlis; zum Berufe des mēlis gehört es auch dass er dem kranken menschen seine Pflicht (josa'ar) verkündet." (ib.p. 110).

Christus, aber nicht vor Christus steht der Apostel in seiner Gemeinde." ⁽¹⁾

When Paul is asking the Corinthians to make a worthy offering he speaks "not by commandment" but he gives his advice (II.8.8,10) and in chapter 10 where he speaks directly of his authority (ἐξουσία) which the Lord has given him for edification (II.10.8; 13.10; cf. 12.19) that is, for teaching, ⁽²⁾ he 'beseeches' them by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, showing that he uses non-carnal weapons to subdue everything that is κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ and the only thing that he is afraid of is that they should be corrupted from the simplicity of this knowledge (II.11.3). II.11.4 is a much-discussed verse and the precise meaning cannot be agreed on but one thing is clear, that in vv.4-6 Paul is stressing the importance of the content of the testimony and the wrongness of altering it; there is only one Jesus, one spirit, one gospel. The testimony is fixed, not in a verbal mould as was that of the scribes, but in its ideas and spirit and when Paul asserts that he is not a whit behind the chiefest apostles (II.11.5; cf. II.12.11) he supports his claim by stating that he may be rude in speech but not in respect of the γνῶσις : that is to say, his gospel is complete. In this he differs from the false

⁽¹⁾ V. Campenhausen, KA und GV., p. 51.

⁽²⁾ Ac.20.32. Οικοδομῆ and its cognates are key-words in any study of 'teaching' in the NT. The rulers, elders and scribes are called by Peter: οἰκοδόμοι who have set at nought the 'stone' which is Jesus (Ac.4.11); Paul speaks of building on a foundation laid by others (Ro.15.20), meaning 'to carry on instruction begun by others'. "Those who by action, instruction, exhortation, comfort, promote the Christian wisdom of others... are said οἰκοδομεῖν (Grimm-Thayer, Lexicon, p. 440b). It would appear from I Cor.14.1ff. that Paul regards prophecy as the highest of the spiritual gifts (after love) because it edifies the Church; all things are to be done unto edifying (I Cor.14.26). To take the ἐξουσία of II Cor.10.8 to prove Paul's official authority over the congregation as Mason (The Conception

apostles, the ἐργάται δόλιοι (II.11.13) who are the descendants of the μάετις ἄδικος and δόλιος of Prov. 14.5,25 etc. who kindles falsehoods. It is tempting also to see in Paul's thorn in the flesh (II.12.7) a reference not to some physical disability but to the opponents of the true faith (cf. Josh.23.13; Ezek.28.24)⁽¹⁾ who in this case, ironically, are the Judaisers.

Still on the subject of his authority Paul in II.12.1 refrains from boasting about his exploits and adventures in the mission work and prefers to speak of visions and revelations in which he has heard inexpressible words;⁽²⁾ he boasts of the message which he has received and not at all of his position. It appears from II.13.3 that the Corinthians are demanding a proof that Paul is really speaking the words of Christ but his only reply to this is that they should examine themselves to see if they are "in the faith" (II.13.5; cf. I.14.37), that is, to see if their own ideas conform to the fixed teaching which he has transmitted to them and which is the only criterion of all teaching. That Paul's authority for edification is based on the primary and more fundamental authority of "the word of His grace" is also shown in Ac.20.32 where Paul commends the Ephesian elders to it for edification.

of the Church, p. 41) is to fail to see that the evidence of the rest of the chapter shows that Paul is referring to the area of his evangelising activity.

(1) Josh.23.13: καὶ ἔσονται ὑμῖν εἰς παγίδας καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλα καὶ εἰς ἥλους ἐν ταῖς πτέρυναις ὑμῶν καὶ εἰς βολίδας ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑμῶν.

Ezek.28.24: καὶ οὐκ ἔσονται οὐκέτι τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ σκόλοψ πικρίας καὶ ἄκανθα ὀδύνης ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν περικύκλῳ αὐτῶν τῶν ἀτιμασάντων αὐτούς.

(2) Dodd's view (The Authority of the Bible, p. 62) that Paul did not exploit his mystical experiences as specially authoritative seems to be justified by II Cor.12.1-5.

The Authority of the Testimony

The testimony or teaching is the power of God (I.1.18) and the wisdom of God (I.1.24) in a mystery, ordained by God before the world began (I.2.7) and revealed by the Spirit (I.2.10). The apostles and other teachers are the servants and stewards of Christ, that is, of the mystery (I.4.1) of which he is the foundation (I.3.11); in fact his words are an unbreakable authority (I.7.10; 9.14; cf. I Thess.4.15).⁽¹⁾ The message is taught by the Spirit (I.2.13; cf. I.12.8) and so the apostles have the mind of Christ (I.2.16). Yet this is not a matter of subjective ideas and opinions and sudden, instinctive expressions;⁽²⁾ the testimony is a definite body of teaching in which the Corinthians are standing (1.15.1).⁽³⁾ The

(1) Cf. Mundle, ZNW. 22(1923), p. 31.

(2) Moore (Judaism. I, p. 239) points out that "The rabbinical schools had no theory of the mode of prophetic inspiration such as.....a state of ecstasy or enthusiasm."

(3) Cf. Ro.5.2; II Cor.1.24; Eph.6.14ff; II Thess.2.15; I.Pet.5.12. Friedrich (KWB. VI. 855.29ff.) distinguishes between Gnosis and Prophecy: "Zu ihn (Gnosis) gelangt man auf spekulative Weise, durch nachdenkendes Versenken in die Geheimnisse des Glaubens. Die Prophetie dagegen beruht auf Inspiration." This is not in line with the fact, already demonstrated, that prophecy is, in fact, γνῶσις, torah, παιδεία, μαρτύριον or διδασχῇ. F. admits (856.6ff.) that the prophet imparts a knowledge which can be learned but denies that prophecy and teaching are to be equated because the prophet is not bound to scripture and tradition!! This point of view is difficult to sympathise with since in I Cor.14.6 προφητεία is sandwiched between γνῶσις and διδασχῇ and it is difficult to reconcile with it Paul's instruction that the prophecies should be judged. F. says of this judging (ib.857.43f.): "Dieses kann nicht verstandesmässig, sondern nur charismatisch-pneumatisch geschehen" but this is meaningless in view of I Cor.14.19-39. To say that the teacher looks to the past and the prophet to the future and that the teaching is tested by scripture and that prophecy has no objective criterion, as Friedrich does (ib.856.13-19), is to deny the whole basis of the prophet's message as the testimony, the torah of God and to deny to the teacher that large part of Christian doctrine which concerns the promises of God. It is significant that F. cannot avoid the correct conclusion that the false prophet is the false teacher (ib.857.26f.).

authority of the testimony depends on faith in the hearer (II. 4.3) and this shows itself in obedience to the gospel (II.9.13; 10.5) and to effect this Paul uses spiritual weapons (II.10.5f.). The testimony which Paul has passed on to the Corinthian church is that which Jesus himself transmitted to Paul. The genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ of I.1.6 is subjective, that is, it is the testimony which Christ taught. That he himself is also the content is also true⁽¹⁾ but it is no more permissible to say that τοῦ Χριστοῦ is an objective genitive in I.1.6⁽²⁾ than it is to say that τοῦ Θεοῦ in I.2.1 is objective genitive for the meaning here is clearly 'the testimony which God has revealed or taught' (cf. IV K.17.13ff.).

The Transmission of the Testimony

The importance of the faithful reception, preservation and further transmission of the testimony is underlined in I.1.10 where Paul beseeches the Corinthians that they all speak the same thing, that there be no schisms among them, that they be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgement. For Paul, the mind which they are to have in common is the mind of Christ which is expressed in the gospel which must not be weakened in any way (I.1.17; cf. I.9.12). No one can lay a foundation of doctrine other than the one already laid which is Jesus Christ (I.3.11).⁽³⁾ The ministers and stewards of Christ, the stewards of the mysteries of God, must be faithful to the teaching they have received (I.4.1f.) and so Paul beseeches the Corinthians to be imitators of himself (I.4.16).⁽⁴⁾ and sends faithful Timothy to remind them of the doctrine

(1) Cf. Cullmann (The Tradition, pp. 66,69): "The risen Christ is himself the author of the Gospel of which he is also the object."

(2) As Günther, Ματθ. 28, p. 109.

(3) Cf. Munck (Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, p.160): "The object of everything said in I Cor.3.4ff. is to teach the Corinthians not to go beyond what is written."

(4) Cf. II Jn.9: μένων ἐν τῇ διδασκῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ .

which he teaches everywhere. Again, in I.11.1f. Paul urges his readers to be imitators of himself and praises them for remembering him and keeping the ordinances (παράδοσεις) as he delivered them. Paul in II Thess.2.13ff. has equated παράδοσις with the truth of the gospel⁽¹⁾ and there is no good reason for regarding it differently here; included in the traditions here are not only instructions for behaviour but also doctrinal matter I.11.23 and 15.1-5. These traditions Paul claims to have received from the Lord (I.11.23) which means that he accepted them as the word of God (cf. I.Thess. 2.13) and he insists that the teaching he has given should be kept and not altered; he has already given thanks that the testimony he transmitted has been confirmed in them in all utterance and in all knowledge (I.1.4-6) and he wishes this to continue.

Verses 1-5 of the resurrection chapter of I Cor. show how Paul stressed his dependence on the traditions for combating false teaching about behaviour generally and in the church and about the nature of God's salvation.⁽²⁾ The παράδοσις or κήρυγμα is the bulwark of the truth about God and man and Paul has determined to know nothing else.⁽³⁾

Finally, Paul in 15.58 exhorts the Corinthians to be steadfast and unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord forasmuch as they know that their labour is not in vain in the Lord. It is very likely that Paul had in mind here

(1) In the ethical instruction which Paul gives in I Cor. it is obvious that he has some detailed knowledge of words of Jesus (see 7.10,12,25; 9.14).

(2) Dahl (Stud. Theol. I (1947/48), p. 89): "Ici encore 'se souvenir' ne veut pas dire retenir dans sa mémoire une notion inerte, mais se remémorer les paroles de Jésus pour en vivre."

(3) Holl (Ges. Aufs. II, p. 46): "Es ist also die sozusagen amtliche Darstellung der Urgemeinde, die er wiedergibt." But he did not necessarily receive it from the Jerusalem apostles.

the similar passage, II Chron.15.1-7, where Azariah the prophet, at the close of a long period when Israel has been "without the true God and without a teaching priest and without law, exhorts Israel in these words: καὶ ὑμεῖς ἰσχύσατε, καὶ μὴ ἐκλυέσθωσαν αἱ χεῖρες ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἔστιν μισθὸς τῇ ἐργασίᾳ ὑμῶν (1) Here the work is clearly the propagation of the μαρτύριον (1) or gospel of God which must be proclaimed until the whole world has heard.

In II Cor. references to the handing on of the tradition are less frequent. In 1.13 Paul insists that his letter contains only teaching of which the Corinthians are well aware and which they have acknowledged and 11.3f. show Paul's deep-seated horror of any corrupting of "the simplicity which is in Christ", that is, of the Gospel, in favour of another Jesus, another Gospel.

Conclusion

In summing up the teaching of I and II Cor. it may be said that here we have a picture of an apostle attempting to exert a spiritual authority based not on some form of commission but entirely on the appeal which his message makes to the conscience

(1) Cf. II Chron.24.19; 34.31.

of his hearers;⁽¹⁾ he insists on the importance only of what he has been given to say and stresses the need for preserving its original content which is that of the OT testimony fulfilled in Jesus Christ. This content is to be preserved not in any rigid, literal way but in the spirit of truth and love. Paul's authority, the authority of the Christian witness, may thus be described as a prophetic,⁽²⁾ teaching authority by virtue of the possession of the doctrine or testimony. However, both the ability to teach and the doctrine itself are charismatic gifts according to I.12.28; (cf. Ro.12.6f. and II.4.6,13,15) which means that the static grace-gift of the testimony becomes dynamic when it is proclaimed in the power of the Spirit and meets the answer or co-testimony of the Spirit in the faith of the hearer.

(1) "Possession of divine authority is never a thing which can be proved by argument. Divine authority is 'numinous', to use Otto's excellent word; it proves itself to those capable of recognising it." (Goudge, First Corinthians, p. xxi).

(2) Cf. Greeven (ZNW. 44 (1952/53), p. 14): "Fragen wir.... welche Bedeutung die Tatsache der Prophetie für die Gemeinde habe, so ist zunächst auf das einfache Faktum hinzuweisen, dass Paulus den 'Propheten' der christlichen Gemeinden mit dieser Bezeichnung den gleichen Würdenamen beilegt, den die grossen Propheten des Alten Bundes tragen" Cf. Michel (Prophet und Märtyrer, p. 14): "Mit Jesu Messianität und dem Apostolat der Jünger Jesu ist der Höhepunkt der prophetischen Entwicklung erreicht."

(3) ROMANSThe Nature of the Testimony

In the Epistle to the Romans Paul uses the expression $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ as an oath of fidelity (1.9; cf. II Cor. 1.23; Phil. 1.8); ⁽¹⁾ similarly, in 9.1 he speaks of the co-testimony of his conscience about his sorrow for the unbelief of the Jews; ⁽²⁾ in 10.2 he uses $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ meaning simply 'to vouch for'.

In addition to these instances there are three other places where words of the $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ -group are employed in connection with the propagation of teaching about God; the first of these is 2.14: The Gentiles.... $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\nu\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \acute{\xi}\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\gamma\epsilon\alpha\pi\tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$, $\sigma\upsilon\mu\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$ $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$. Here the conscience of the Gentile is regarded as a co-witness with his behaviour to the fact of the law. ⁽³⁾ In view of the context, $\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ must be regarded here simply as the ethical aspect of the testimony ⁽⁴⁾ and there is

(1) Cf. Str/Bill. III, p. 26. Burnier (La Notion de Témoinage, p. 50: "Il est important de noter que la prédication de l'Evangile est ainsi placée sous la garantie immédiate de Dieu ce témoignage est le fondement même de l'autorité de l'apôtre."

(2) Lagrange (Epître aux Romains, pp. 224f.) says well: "Ici Paul s'unit au Christ, qui est plus qu'un témoin intérieur, un principe de vérité; cf. II Cor. II.17; XII.19. C'est de cette manière qu'il affirme ce qui se passe en lui. En même temps sa conscience, qui est avec l'Esprit - Saint dans les mêmes rapports d'union que lui-même avec le Christ, rend témoignage. Ce ne sont point trois témoins (Chrys., Jér. etc.) mais une affirmation, confirmée par un témoignage; le co-témoignage ($\sigma\upsilon\mu\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\sigma\eta\varsigma$) s'explique parce que l'affirmation est déjà un témoignage rendu à la vérité. Les hommes disent ordinairement: je parle en conscience. Paul a voulu ajouter qu'il agissait en union avec le Christ, conformément à une conscience dont l'Esprit-Saint était le principe intérieur."

(3) Cf. Leaney, The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon, p. 48.

(4) "To Paul $\acute{\omicron}\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ was, save in exceptional cases, the revealed will of God, and the primary reference of the term was to the revelation of that will in the OT.... Most frequently it is

no thought of office or authority and certainly none of eye-witness testimony of facts.

In 3.21 Paul speaks of the revealing of a righteousness of God independent of legalism, a righteousness which is by faith in Jesus Christ, which is μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν (cf. 15.4; 16.26).⁽¹⁾ Here, clearly, μαρτυρεῖν means 'to teach' and the μαρτύριον is the Gospel. Paul is saying that the teaching of Moses and the other prophets pointed forward to the Christian Gospel.⁽²⁾

The Content of the Testimony is, briefly expressed, the righteousness of God independent of legalism; this righteousness of God which is by faith in Jesus Christ is in fact Christ himself (10.4; cf. I Cor. 1.30).⁽³⁾ The testimony of the law and the prophets has already been shown to comprise four aspects and these can be seen in Paul's amplifying of his thought in the verses which follow: (a) God is the glorious One (3.23), the God of the whole world (3.29) who raises the dead and creates 'ex nihilo' (4.17). (b) The phrase 'righteousness of God' (3.21) implies his moral demand which is established by

the law of OT, or more specifically, the Mosaic code that is referred to and this reference is indicated by the prefixing of the article, designating the well-known or previously mentioned law...When the law is viewed simply as a concrete fact or historic regime, is spoken of qualitatively...simply in its character as law (historically or concretely viewed), the article is regularly omitted." (Burton, Galatians, p. 455).

(1) Casey (The Beginnings of Christianity, I, p. 33) distinguishes between Luke's conception of witness and that of Paul as between the eye-witness testimony of the closed group and "the whole of the revelation dispensed by the Spirit" but gives no indication of the difference in content. Actually there is no difference!

(2) Ro. 1.2; 3.31; 4; 9.25-33; 10.16-21; 11.1-10; 26-29; 15.8-12; 16.26 etc. (Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 83).

(3) Cf. Heb. 5.12f. where the author upbraids his readers for being unskilful in the word of righteousness when they ought to be teachers.

the Christian preachers (3.31). (c) The rebellion of men is met by the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (3.24f.) and (d) God's promise of new life is summed up in the promise to Abraham (4.13,16) and the resurrection of Jesus (4.24), while the thought of the Judgement day is expressed in 2.16.⁽¹⁾

In Ro.8.16 Paul writes: αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα συνμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμεν τέκνα Θεοῦ. The testimony of the Spirit is the testimony of Jesus himself who is the Logos "who bears witness for God to us and to God for us".⁽²⁾ In these 'witness' passages of Romans the testimony emerges as the fulfilment of the OT μαρτύριον about the righteousness of the creator God who demands righteousness from his people, who always remained faithful to the covenant with Israel and ready to save them and perfect them; it is the Gospel of God (10.16), the Gospel of Christ (1.16), the torah of the spirit of life (8.2), the transmitted doctrine (6.17),⁽³⁾ the Gospel of good things (10.15), the word of Christ (10.17), the word of the faith which the apostles proclaim (10.8), the kerygma of Jesus Christ and the mystery kept secret since the world began (16.25); it is, in short, Jesus the Christ.⁽⁴⁾

(1) Cf. Friedrich, KWB. II, 728.5ff.

(2) K. Barth, Romans. p. 298. Preiss (Le Témoignage intérieure, p. 24) gives, without reason, a curious interpretation: "le verbe συνμαρτυρεῖν ne signifie pas ici témoigner avec quelqu'un d'autre, mais attester à, témoigner à quelqu'un d'autre."

(3) That διδαχή and διδασκαλία are interchangeable is evident from II Tim.4.2f. and the latter is used by Eusebius for 'the gospel' (Eccl. Hist. 2.1.6) where Thaddaeus is described as 'herald and evangelist τῆς περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδασκαλίας'."

(4) Cf. Friedrich, KWB. II, 728.24f.

The Content of the Testimony

The content of this testimony of the Spirit is the fact that Christians are the children of God and this is seen to embrace the four aspects of the original testimony in that (a) the Spirit is that by which the Christian knows God as Father (8.15), (b) the moral law is still binding but those who are in the spirit can please God (8.13,8f.) since (c) God has delivered up his son for us all and (d) "He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies" (8.11).

The Authority of the Witnesses

The evidence in Romans as to the authority of the people who pass on the word shows that Paul laid no great store by this authority. In describing himself as a servant of Jesus Christ (1.1) Paul associates himself with the servant-witness of Deutero-Isaiah⁽¹⁾ and with the prophets generally⁽²⁾ and the phrase 'called to be an apostle' springs undoubtedly from the same source.⁽³⁾ Paul's authority is like that of the prophets by whom God had promised the gospel which Paul preached (1.2; cf. 3.21), that is to say it is an authority which depends on the ability of the hearer to "see" the truth which is "seen" and proclaimed by the prophet or witness. In 10.15 Paul states that "heralds imply a commission"⁽⁴⁾ and by quoting Is.52.7; 65.1f.; Ps.19.4 and Dt. 32.21 he practically identifies kerygma, prophecy and apostleship. Paul's own commission is to

(1) Cf. Is.43.10-12; Jer.1.4f. etc.

(2) καὶ διαμαρτύρεται Κύριος ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἰουδᾷ ἐν χειρὶ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ, παντὸς ὁρῶντος, λέγων Ἀποστεάφατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑμῶν τῶν πονηρῶν καὶ φυλάξατε τὰς ἐντολὰς μου καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα μου καὶ πάντα τὸν νόμον, ὃν ἐνετειλάνην τοῖς πατέσιν ὑμῶν ὅσα ἀπέστειλα αὐτοῖς ἐν χειρὶ τῶν δούλων μου τῶν προφητῶν (IV.K.17.13; cf. IV K.9.7; 21.10; 24.2; Jer.7.25; Dan.9.6.10 (where παῖς is used by LXX and δούλος by @), Am3.7; Zech.1.6 etc.)

(3) Cf. Is.43.1; 48.16.

(4) Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 292.

speak to the Gentiles; this is his διακονία.⁽¹⁾ In chapter 12 where Paul introduces the charismata he urges his hearers to be careful not to think of any spiritual gift as conferring higher status than another and to 'give pride of place to one another in esteem' (12.10) (NEB) and in 14.4 he forbids them to judge one another. Over against this, however, is to be set the fact that, as in Thessalonica and Corinth, so in Rome there are already in the church men filled with all knowledge, (γνῶσις) able to admonish (νουθετεῖν)⁽²⁾ one another (15.14) and Paul is emboldened by the grace given to him to be a λειτουργός of Jesus Christ ministering (ἡεργουμένωντα) the gospel of God (15.15f.) to remind⁽³⁾ them of the way in which they as Christians, ought to behave. He does not claim this authority as something adhering to his own person which gives him power to dictate to them but only as a grace-gift to minister the gospel.

The Authority of the Testimony

On the other hand Paul makes large claims for the gospel to which he has been separated by God (Ro.1.1).⁽⁴⁾ It was promised by God through the OT prophets, it was made manifest through the prophetic writings (16.26) and it is the power of God unto salvation to every one who believes (1.16) for it is the place of the revelation of God's righteousness (1.17). Sanday and Headlam⁽⁵⁾ interpret the τύπον διδασχῆς of 6.17 as being solely ethical teaching but it is perhaps more in line

(1) Cf. Ac.6.4.

(2) See above p. 336, note 1.

(3) The root-meaning of μέμνημι is connected with remembering and so presumably with reminding.

(4) Cf. Ac.13.2.

(5) Romans (1.C.C.), p. 166.

with the apostle's thought to take it as referring to the whole gospel⁽¹⁾ and to translate παρδδοθητε as 'you were committed',⁽²⁾ thus confirming the existence of a fixed form of teaching known throughout the church in Rome. This cannot be mere ethical teaching because the mainstay of Paul's preaching is that simply to obey or to attempt to obey the moral law is doomed to failure. The doctrine here referred to must be that of the whole gospel⁽³⁾ which Paul sums up as justification by faith and which frees men from sin and enables them to become servants of righteousness (6.18). This interpretation is borne out by 10.13-17 where salvation is shown to be dependent on obedience to the gospel for which a preacher must be sent and also by 16.17 where Paul beseeches the church to mark and avoid those who "cause divisions and stumbling-blocks contrary to the doctrine" for these do not serve our Lord Jesus Christ, that is, they do not preach him. For Paul the gospel is a gift of grace (τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν) (15.15f.) and he preaches it by word and deed, by the power of the spirit of God. This does not mean, however, that the μαρτυρία is necessarily an ecstatic.⁽⁴⁾

(1) Διδαχή is used in the NT for teaching about Jesus' Messiahship (Jn.7.16; II Jn.9f.), the resurrection of Jesus and the resurrection generally (Mt.22.33; Ac.17.19), the Sermon on the Mount (Mt.7.28), the body of Christian teaching (Ac.2.42; Ro.16.17, II Tim.4.2f., Heb.13.9, Jesus' teaching, described as bearing witness to the truth (Jn.18.19,37), the death and resurrection of Jesus (Ac.5.28), the teaching of Jesus about himself (Jn.7.17), the word of God (Ac.13.12 with v.7), the faithful word (Tit.1.9) and the mystery of the Kingdom of God (Mk.4.2; 12.38).

(2) Cf. Thuc. 5.16; Plat. Phaedr. 250D. RCV.

(3) Cf. Rengstorf, KWB. II, 167.1f.

(4) "Ecstasies and illuminations, inspirations and intuitions, are not necessary.....they are patch-work by-products!" (K. Barth, Romans, p. 298).

At the close of the epistle Paul speaks of his gospel and the kerygma of Jesus Christ⁽¹⁾ in which God is able to establish his readers⁽²⁾ showing that the spiritual gift he hopes to impart to the end they may be established (1.11) is related directly to the gospel message.⁽³⁾

The Transmission of the Testimony

In this Epistle Paul makes it clear that the Gospel which he has been commissioned to preach and minister (ἐκείνου γένει) is a body of life-giving doctrine which is to be kept pure in the Church and passed on to others (16.25). Paul longs to impart to the Christians in Rome some spiritual charisma in order that they may be established and, with his customary humility, he hastens to explain that this will mean that he also will participate in the benefit through the faith or gospel which they share (1.11f.). Other men, by holding the truth in unrighteousness (1.18) and by not thinking it worthwhile to hold God in their knowledge (1.28), have turned God's truth into a lie but the διδασχῇ which the Romans have learned is to be preserved in its original purity; those who teach

(1) Subj. gen. with Friedrich (KWB. III, 716, note 16): "die Botschaft die Jesus Christus verkündigt hat."

(2) Cf. II Thess. 3.3; I Pet. 5.10.

(3) Cf. I Thess. 3.2: "We sent Timotheus, fellow-worker of God in the gospel to establish you and strengthen you in your faith." Brosch, in the Roman tradition, speaks of the "transitorische charakter" of the charismatic (Charismen und Ämter, p. 45 and p. 145, note 546) but this is contradicted by Ro. 1.11.

anything contrary are to be shunned (16.17f.) and it is significant that in 16.19 Paul rounds off this advice with what is practically a word-for-word quotation of Jesus' own injunction to his followers to be as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves (Mt.10.16).

Just as the oracles of God were committed to the Jews (3.1f.) so the new torah, the righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ is being manifested (3.21) in the word of faith (10.8) and for this heralds are necessary. It is not sufficient, however, for a convert to have heard the word once only - it has to be repeated - so Paul is glad to realise that these Christians to whom he is writing are filled with all knowledge and yet are able to admonish each other; and yet this does not prevent him from reminding them himself about the truth of the Gospel (15.14f.).

(4) GALATIANSThe Nature of the Testimony

In Galatians, the remaining epistle of the early Pauline group, the apostle uses μαρτυρεῖν in 4.15 meaning simply 'to vouch for' when he testifies to the friendly way in which the Galatians had received him when he first visited them and in 5.3 he writes: μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθεώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι where μαρτύρομαι means 'to testify solemnly'.⁽¹⁾

The Content of the Testimony

The content of this solemn teaching includes (a) sovereignty of God implied in the reference to the kingdom of God in 5.21; (b) in the discussion about right and wrong behaviour God's moral law is described as the law of love (5.14) and the law of Christ which must be fulfilled by love (6.2). (c) The work of grace wrought by God in Christ appears in 5.1, 4, 11 and (d) his promise is understood in the reference to the Christian waiting for the hope of righteousness by faith (5.5; cf. 6.8f.). Thus what Paul testifies is the gospel, the λόγος.⁽²⁾

In 3.8 Paul traces this testimony or gospel to the promise made to Abraham, the scriptures foresee (προϊδοῦσα) God's plan to justify the Gentiles and so they can be said to testify.⁽³⁾

(1) Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 203 and Burton, Galatians, p. 274: "differing from μαρτυρεῖν in that it denotes a strong asseveration, not simple testimony."

(2) Burton, Galatians, pp. 337f.

(3) Προεγράψειν in 3.1 is better taken as 'to write beforehand', in view of 3.8.

The Authority of the Witnesses

The first two chapters of the epistle are largely taken up with Paul's defence of his prophetic⁽¹⁾ authority in which he affirms that this does not have its source in men like that claimed by the false apostles nor is it conveyed through men⁽²⁾ but by Jesus Christ and God (like that of the Twelve)⁽³⁾ and it shows itself in the fact that he preaches the same gospel,

(1) "Paulus schildert seine Berufung als prophetisch analog der Erwählung und Aussendung der Jeremia." (Gal.1,15.16). (Michel: Prophet und Märtyrer, p. 9).

(2) Cf. 1QH.15.12ff.; 18.18-21. Delling (KWB. IV, 15.3-5) says that it is better to take this as a reference to the legalistic oral tradition than to deny the human element in the revelation and regard the content as "nicht das Traditionsgut der in dem historischen Tatsachenbericht geformten Überlieferung von Jesussondern nur die innere Lebendigkeit des Glaubens."

(3) Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 71; Burton: Galatians, p. 3. Gerhardsson (Memory and Manuscript, pp. 296f.) believes that Paul received the authoritative logos directly from the Jerusalem apostles and supposes that the point when he received it was during the fourteen days which he spent with Peter after his three-year sojourn in Arabia (Gal.1.18). This supposition is based on Kilpatrick's interpretation (in New Testament Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson, pp.144ff.) of ἵστορεῖν = 'to get information from' but Grimm-Thayer gives another equally if not more appropriate meaning - 'to become personally acquainted with!' (pp.308f.). Doubtless the information came first of all from the Church in Damascus through Ananias the μαθητής and apostle (9.17), εὐλαβὴς κατὰ τὸν νόμον. ; cf. Allo, Première Epître aux Corinthiens, p. 395. It is through Ananias' ministrations that Saul receives 'sight', through the Holy Spirit after the former has been told that Saul is to be the bearer of the Lord's name or gospel. Paul was 'certain days' - an indefinite time - with the disciples in Damascus and then proclaimed Christ openly (εὐθέως) in the synagogues. Paul's confounding of the Damascus Jews by proof from the scriptures would scarcely have been possible without the knowledge which Gerhardsson supposes he got three years later. In point of fact there is nothing to prove that Paul had not listened to the teaching of Jesus himself (II Cor.5.16) and he certainly must have heard Stephen (Ac.7.58).

testifies and re-testifies the same message (5.3).⁽¹⁾ His call and appointment to preach were a revelation which did not have to be confirmed by those who were apostles before him (1. 15-17) for it was three years after his conversion that he had his first meeting with Peter and for the following fourteen years he was known in Judaea only by reports of his missionary activity for which the Judaeans glorified God and did not question Paul's authority. When he did return to Jerusalem and laid before the leaders⁽²⁾ of the church the gospel he had been preaching to the Gentiles, just in case he had been preaching the wrong message,⁽³⁾ they perceived the grace entrusted to him (the gospel committed to him) and admitted that his right to preach the gospel to the Gentiles was the same as that of Peter to preach it to the Jews (2.2-9). It is quite clear that Paul's being accepted by the Jerusalem apostles was due to his

(1) Cf. von Campenhausen, Stud. Theol. (1947/48), pp.106-110. Burton (Galatians, pp. 3f.) holds the view that Paul does not answer the denial of his authority, as "Barnabas or Mark might have done, with the assertion that he was true to the teaching of the Twelve, but by affirming that he possessed an independent apostleship, neither derived from a human source nor through a human channel," but Gal.2.6 disposes of this; his message has the same content as that of the Twelve.

(2) οἱ δὲ στήθετες i.e. James, Cephas and John. The expression is not used with irony (as Burton, Galatians, p. 71) but it certainly shows a fine apathy concerning 'position' in the Church. James, Cephas and John are pillars, not foundations.

(3) 'Running' denotes the work of the prophet (Jer.23.21; Hab.2.2 Ps.147.4; Phil.2.16. Riesenfeld (The Gospel Tradition, p. 19) states correctly that Paul's chief concern was "that Peter should test whether he, Paul, during his term of preparation, had really made the tradition of the words and deeds of Jesus his own."

testimony being identical with theirs (2.6).⁽¹⁾ The Galatians had received him at first as a messenger of God, as Christ Jesus, but this must have been on account of the message he brought, for a laying-on of hands by complete strangers in far-away Jerusalem would have carried little weight with them. Von Campenhausen⁽²⁾ stresses the basic importance of Paul's consciousness of being called by Jesus Christ but a consciousness of being called by Christ can be demonstrated only by adherence in word and deed to the testimony which Jesus taught; calling and testimony cannot be separated.

It would appear from 6.6 that even at this time there were people who were acting as instructors in the gospel and who, according to Paul, had at least a moral right to some form of remuneration. Beyer⁽³⁾ sees here a sort of professional rabbinic teaching authority later taken over by the bishops and other charismatics but there is no indication here or in Lk.1.4 or Ac.18.25 of an official status.

The Authority of the Testimony

The gospel or testimony is regarded by Paul as the basis of the preacher's authority as is apparent from 1.8f.⁽⁴⁾ where

(1) Cf. Schweizer, Church Order, 7g. Sass (Apostelamt und Kirche p. 140) states that Paul is different from the other witnesses in a decisive way - "Er verkündigte Christus in Gottes Auftrag, aber nicht deshalb, weil er in dem Sinne zur Zeugenschaft befähigt gewesen wäre, wie die jerusalemischen oder galiläischen christlichen Boten. Er konnte nur als Zeuge des Auferstandenen gelten (1 Kor.9.1). Dem Act. 1.27 ausgesprochenen Grundsatz stellt er 2 Kor.5.16 einen neuen entgegen." But this fails to take into account 1 Cor.1 and 2 where Paul presents the testimony of the Cross.

(2) K.A. und G.V., p. 35 and note 1.

(3) KWB. III, 639.24 - 640.14.

(4) Cf. von Campenhausen, Stud. Theol. (1947/48), p. 123.

Schweizer (Church Order, 7g) says that Paul's authority "is based not on tradition, but on a direct meeting with the risen Christ" but Gal.1.12 in that case could not refer to all the facts of Jesus' life and teaching; this revelation is 'the spiritual

he affirms that if he himself alters it he loses his authority and that even if a messenger from heaven were to preach another gospel he should be regarded as anathema. No degree of delegated authority by way of a call or commission or the like can set itself over the truth of the gospel⁽¹⁾ for this is what gives the $\gamma\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ of God (4.9) and is contrasted with the weak and beggarly elements of the Galatians' former religion. It is God's message; Paul was taught it by revelation and he opposed the false brethren not in order to establish and retain his own position but simply that the truth of the gospel might continue with the Galatians (2.5).⁽²⁾ If 2.7,9 are set alongside one another it would appear that the grace given to Paul is equivalent to the gospel committed to him. That this gospel judges the actions even of apostles commissioned by Jesus in his life-time and after his resurrection who do not walk uprightly according to its truth is evident from 2.14 and that men should obey this truth is Paul's paramount concern (3.1; 5.7).

understanding of the historical facts which showed him salvation in Jesus and in Jesus alone.' (Lagrange, Epître aux Galates, p.11).

(1) Against Brosch (Charismen und Ämter, p. 131) who admits that $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\iota\alpha$ has the meaning of office in Ac.1.17 and also Ro.11.13 and continues: "Die Bestätigung für dieses Amt der Heidenmission hatte es ja von den Altaposteln Jakobus, Petrus und Johannes, die als Säulen galten, zusammen mit Barnabas erhalten."

(2) Cf. Holl (Ges. Aufs. II, p. 63): "Es kommt nicht auf die einzelne Person als solche, sondern auf ihr Zeugnis von Christus an" - a sentiment which is contrary to his conclusion that Peter was very much in agreement (cf. Ac. 10.34). Peter's reference here is to the preacher or teacher who imparted the Gospel ($\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\alpha\varsigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\nu$) (10.35). It is Peter's repetition of the message which occasions the descent of the Spirit with a result similar to Pentecost (10.46).

Gal.1.11f. at first sight gives the impression that Paul did not receive the gospel through the natural channels of *παράδοσις* but the influence of people like Stephen to whose preaching and teaching Paul had listened and Ananias (the Lord's messenger to Saul to give him sight and that he might receive the Holy Spirit (Ac. 9.17)) and the other disciples at Damascus must have been considerable. While Paul possibly was not taught the faith in the rabbinic style yet the ideas of the gospel, the revelation (Mt. 11.25-27) must have been imparted to him through human beings.⁽¹⁾ There is a parallel to this thought in I Thess. 2.13 where Paul thanks God that when the Thessalonians received his tradition they received, not a word of men, but, as it truly is, a word of God (cf. Jn. 1.12f.; II Jn. 4). It is significant that Paul refers this gospel back directly to the Lord; it is Jesus' gospel; in I Cor. he had called it the testimony taught by Christ (1.6). Thus Althaus is right in suggesting⁽²⁾ that the relation of the kerygma and the history about which it informs us should be a subject of enquiry, and in implying that "It is a part of the authority of the preaching as word of God that it can claim to have its source in genuine history."⁽³⁾ The insecurity of faith, the 'sola fide'

(1) Büchsel (KWB. II, 175) says correctly: "Das Wesentliche ist für Paulus, dass die Überlieferung überkommen ist (I K. 15.13), vom Herrn her kommt (11.23)." It is clear that Paul is not here denying the form through which he received the message but only that its original source is the Rabbinic tradition; cf. M. Barth (Die Augenzeuge, p. 53): "so beschreibt er (Paul) damit die subjektive Seite des objektiven Vorgangs, dass Gott ihm direkt gesagt hat, was er der Apostel wissen, lehren und verkündigen soll." Sohm (Kirchenrecht, p. 56, note 1) comments correctly on Gal. 1.1: "Damit ist menschliche Mitwirkung.....nicht ausgeschlossen, nämlich als Mittel der Offenbarung des göttlichen Willens (Prophetie)" and quotes Ig. ad Philad. 1.1 as a parallel. For *Κύριος* = *παράδοσις* see Cullmann, The Tradition, pp. 66ff.

(2) The So-called Kerygma, passim.

(3) Op. cit., p. 32.

of the Reformers which is insisted upon by Bultmann is safeguarded not by by-passing the historical but by the fact that a particular historical event can be interpreted either as a salvation-event or as a natural phenomenon without reference to the spiritual, depending on the presence or absence of faith. Bultmann lays too much stress on the kerygma to the neglect of the historical event; Althaus rightly lays stress on "the historical reliability of the story of Jesus in the NT narratives" and in seeing that the salvation event is not real unless it is historical⁽¹⁾ but he is scarcely correct in calling the historical reliability of the story of Jesus an essential constituent of the basis of faith, rather is it the essential pre-requisite for faith, the raw material which faith interprets. The content of Christian faith is not "Jesus lived and taught and died and appeared"; the content of the Christian faith is "Jesus lived and showed men God's nature, Jesus taught and spoke the command of God, Jesus died and redeemed mankind, Jesus appeared and opened the gates of everlasting life."

At least two witnesses are required to present the testimony of God; one must be a man and the other must be the Holy Spirit. Whether the man be an eye-witness of the events of the Incarnation, whether he be Jesus himself, his testimony must be accompanied by the faith-rousing testimony of the Spirit of God before the events become salvation-event. Althaus says that Golgotha is not everywhere but in Jerusalem;⁽²⁾ that is true and yet in Revelation 13.8 John states that the Cross is from the foundation of the world.

(1) Op. cit., pp. 61f.
 (2) Op. cit., p. 58.

Paul, even if the denial in Gal.1.11f. is based on Is.29.13, 18,24, would not deny that revelation is effected through teaching (I Cor.2.13; Gal.6.6; Eph. 4.20f.). Burton's conclusion is appropriate: "The new conception of Jesus which Paul gained by the revelation of Christ in him furnished the premise from which the essential elements of his gospel were derived."⁽¹⁾

The Transmission of the Testimony

Paul is very concerned for the preservation of his gospel in its original form and pronounces anathema on anyone who distorts it (1.8f.).⁽²⁾ Indeed there are already people in Galatia who are trying to alter it (1.7) for their own ends (6.12). The apostle wishes to make it clear that just as Jesus denied a human source for his testimony (Jn.5.34) (that is to say, he did not rely on the authority of a previous teacher in the manner of the Rabbis) so he, Paul, rejects the attempts of the Judaizers to turn the freedom of the spirit of the gospel into slavery to the letter of a legal tradition (2.4; 4.9), the yoke of bondage (5.1). He says that his gospel is not κατὰ ἄνθρωπον as theirs is, which probably means that he does not preach and teach it for his own ends as they do (6.12; cf. I Thess.2.4). When he says that he has not received the gospel from or was taught it by men he does not exclude some form of human tradition as is known from his reference in 6.6 to the obligation on the part of the catechumen to provide his teacher with some kind of remuneration for his services (cf. Ro.15.27).

Paul's use of the technical term παραλαμβάνειν in 1.9 shows that there was already a form of traditional teaching in the Church and in chapter 2 he gives as his reason for his second visit to Jerusalem that he went up κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν (2.2).

⁽¹⁾Galatians, p. 42.

⁽²⁾Burton, (Galatians, p. 37): "That the gospel preached by him is always the same is at once suggested by the use of the present tense, ἐστίν."

This has usually been taken to mean 'according to revelation' but *κατά* with the accusative can also mean 'for the purpose of'.⁽¹⁾ Thus it is possible that in Gal.2.1-9 Paul is saying that he went to Jerusalem for revelation, that is, for advice (not necessarily only to receive it) in case the gospel he had been imparting to the Gentiles was out of line with the original testimony. This is in accord with Ac.15 where it is stated not that Paul received as it were a sudden summons from God to go to Jerusalem but that the Church in Antioch, disturbed by the teaching of the men who had come from Judaea and after much preliminary discussion, decided to send Paul and the others to settle the question (*ζητήματα*) with the apostles and elders at Jerusalem.

Paul opposed even Peter on the question of the relationship of Gentile and Jew (2.11) and rebuked him and Barnabas and their Jewish companions for not walking uprightly in the truth of the gospel (2.14).

⁽¹⁾ LS. I. p. 883.B.III.1.

(5) THE PRISON EPISTLESThe Nature of the Testimony

Each of the Prison Epistles contains one of the *μαρτυς*-group. In Phil.1.8 Paul uses the confirmatory oath: *μαρτυς γάρ μου ὁ Θεός* to support his protestation of concern for the church at Philippi⁽¹⁾ and in Col. 4.13, when telling the Colossians of Epaphras' zeal for them, says: *μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτῷ ὅτι ἔχει πολλὸν πόνον ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, using *μαρτυρεῖν* meaning 'to vouch for'.

In Eph.4.17 the author employs *μαρτύρομαι* in the prophetic and hortatory sense: *τοῦτο οὖν λέγω καὶ μαρτύρομαι ἐν Κυρίῳ*.⁽²⁾ Paul testifies (*μαρτύρομαι*) that the Ephesians should not live like other Gentiles whose walk is described in 4.17-19, and then in v.20 Paul says: "Ye have not so learned Christ if so be that ye have heard him and been taught by him as the truth is in Jesus, thus identifying *μαρτύρεσθαι* and *διδάσκειν*, what he testifies being a repetition of what they have been taught."⁽³⁾

This testimony which is the truth as it is in Jesus (cf. 1.13) is to be completed as the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of God (1.17); it is a gift of grace the stewardship of which has been committed to Paul (3.2; cf. 4.29 and Col. 1.23,25), the mystery made known to him by revelation

(1) Vincent, Philippians, p.10.

(2) *Ἐν Κυρίῳ* may quite well mean 'by, or in, the teaching of the Lord'; cf. Gullmann, The Tradition, pp. 66ff. At any rate Abbott (Ephesians, p. 128) expresses the root of the matter: "Here.....it is implied that the apostle speaks with authority."
 (3) Cf. Abbott (Ephesians, p. 128): "The notion of exhortation and precept is involved in this (*μαρτύρομαι*) and *λέγω* by the nature of the following context."

(3.3), his knowledge in the mystery of Christ (3.4), revealed by the Spirit (3.5); it is the mystery of the Gospel (6.19; cf. Col. 1.25-27). It is παιδεία καὶ νοουθεσία (6.4).⁽¹⁾

The Content of the Testimony

The content of the testimony is seen in its four different aspects: (a) The nature of the true God who is eternal (1.4; 3.11) and far above all principality and power and might and dominion and every name (1.21), after whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named (3.15), the one God and father of all who is above all (4.6). (b) God's moral law is given in many of its details; Christians are chosen by God that they may be holy and without blame before him in love (1.4); they are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works which God has pre-ordained (2.10); they are to walk worthy of their vocation (4.1) by putting on the new man who is created by God in righteousness and true holiness (4.24) summed up by 'walking in love' (5.2). (c) The redemptive work of God in Christ is stated directly in 1.7: "We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace"; the word of truth is the gospel of salvation (1.13; cf. 2.13,16). (d) God's promise and its fulfilment find expression in 1.13f, 18 where the author speaks of the spirit of promise as the earnest of the Christian's inheritance (cf. 4.30). There is mention made also of the wrath of God which is coming upon the children of disobedience (5.6).

(¹) Seeligman (The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, p. 109): "Hellenistic Jewry may have had a tendency to represent prophecy as teaching, παιδεία :". This tendency may explain the LXX translation of Am. 3.7. The Isaiah translation contains one passage which appears to identify prophesying with παιδεία i.e. 50.4f. Here it is the Hebrew text itself which suggests such an identity.

The Authority of the Witnesses

The authority of the witness in Paul's case is outlined thus: He is an apostle of Jesus by the will of God (1.1)⁽¹⁾ but this does not give him a monopoly of revelation, for God has made known to all Christians the mystery of his will (1.9) and Paul's prayer for the Ephesians shows that they also may share the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of God, that the eyes of their understanding may be enlightened (1.17f.). He regards the apostles and prophets as the original teachers upon whose message (that is Christ, the Word) the Ephesians have been built (2.20).⁽²⁾

In support of his claim to be numbered among the apostles and prophets of 2.20 and 3.5 Paul says that he has been given the stewardship of the grace of God (3.2, cf. vv. 7f.),⁽³⁾ that he has been apprised of the mystery by revelation (3.3) and that he has a recognised knowledge in the mystery of Christ. Paul will not exercise any authority based on sanctions other than the power of the appeal of the Spirit; he does not command, he beseeches (4.1) and admits that grace has been given to every church member (4.7). To this end God has given the apostles,

(1) This "simply expresses....that his mission was due to the special and undeserved providence of God, not to any merit of his own." (Abbott, Ephesians, pp. 1f.).

(2) With Hort, The Christian Ecclesia, pp. 165-167; Schweizer: Church Order, 24b. Taken together with I Cor. 3.11 the genitives τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν must be possessive or signify authorship, or the phrase means 'the foundation on which the prophets themselves were built.'

(3) Οἰκονομία τῆς χάριτος is really 'the stewardship of the gospel' as is seen from the corresponding phrase οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου and also from I Cor. 9.16-18 and Lk. 16.1-11 (and the other parables about the stewardship of the Lord's goods) with Col. 1.25. And yet this phrase οἰκονομία τῆς χάριτος is usually taken as if the grace refers to Paul's calling to preach, his activity as an apostle; cf. Friedrich, KWB, II, 717.3-8.

prophets, evangelists, pastors⁽¹⁾ and teachers⁽²⁾ for the teaching ministry,⁽³⁾ for the perfecting⁽⁴⁾ of knowledge of the faith and the son of God on the part of the whole membership (4.12f.). Paul is here trying to undermine the authority of the false teachers who have been altering the terms of the gospel (4.14; cf. Jude 12) and he realises that this can be done only by insisting that the church should adhere to the original faith and ἐπίγνωσις of the Son of God (4.13) by which alone the church builds itself up in love. It is on

(1) Jeremias (KWB. VI. 486, note 29) gives a list of fourteen OT instances of the shepherd as political or military leader but of these nine are suspect. In I K.21.8 and Is.56.11 the LXX does not use ποιμήν. Jer.2.8; 3.15; 10.21 and 22.22 with 23.1-4, (cf. vv. 10-34) clearly refer to the priestly, prophetic teaching class. In Mic. 5.3 it is the Lord who shepherds, that is, teaches (cf. Mk. 6.34). Finally, in Zech. 10.3 the shepherds are obviously the ἀποφθεγγόμενοι, the false prophets who have comforted (παρεκαλοῦν) in vain (v.2). Eccles. 12.11 mentions the shepherd-teacher as does Prov. 10.21 (Heb.) and the Rabbis gave teachers this title (Str/Bill. II, 537). Jeremias links the ποιμένες of Eph. 4.11 with the πρεσβύτεροι and ἐπίσκοποι (KWB. VI. 497.14ff.). Harnack deduces from Eph. 2.20 and 3.5 that the author reckoned the shepherds as the leaders of the individual churches but that they are among the preachers bestowed upon the Church as a whole and that teachers are looked upon as belonging to a definite church (The Expansion of Christianity, pp. 423f.) but it is impossible to separate preachers and teachers in this way as has already been shown above. For the elder as teacher in Rabbinic Judaism and the Qumran sect see Bornkamm (KWB. V, 659. 32-660.30).

(2) Greeven (ZNW. 44 (1952/53), p. 37, note 88) sees the pastors and teachers as "ganz oder teilweise identisch."

(3) Cf. Jer. 23.2 where the pastors are those who are supposed to feed the people and thus to exercise ἐπισκοπή; vv. 9,11 seem to link these with the prophets and priests; cf. Jn.10.10-12.

(4) That is, teaching; cf. I Chron. 25.8 where τελεσίων is contrasted with μανθανόντων.

this basis that Paul 'testifies in the Lord'. He speaks in 5.18-21 of the way in which the Christians in Ephesus should subordinate themselves to one another in the reverence of God, thus showing the very loose form of organisation existing in Ephesus at that time.

The connection between the dynamic character of the spirit and the static nature of the gospel which Paul testifies is seen in 6.18ff. where Paul asks the Ephesians to pray for him that he may be given utterance in the opening of his mouth⁽¹⁾ to speak boldly although he has already been given the word, the mystery, by revelation (3.2ff.).⁽²⁾

The leaders of the Church mentioned in Eph. 4.11 are all charismatics of the prophet-teacher class.⁽³⁾ Tychicus is a διάκονος whose function is παρακαλεῖν (Eph. 6.21f.) and in Col. 4.7 he is called διάκονος καὶ σύνδουλος ἐν Κυρίῳ. Timothy is called a δοῦλος along with Paul himself (Phil. 1.1),⁽⁴⁾ one who has served with the latter in the gospel. Epaphroditus is Paul's companion in labour (συνεργόν) and an apostle (Phil. 2.25). The anonymous yoke-fellow of Phil. 4.3 and others are fellow-labourers in the gospel. Epaphras is a fellow-servant (σύνδουλος) (Col. 1.7; cf. Rev. 19.10) and διάκονος.⁽⁵⁾ Sass's position⁽⁶⁾: "Ein Apostel muss

(1) Cf. Ps. 51.15; Col. 4.3.

(2) Cf. Is. 59.21 and 55.3 (in which the Spirit and the covenant, law and utterance are linked with the idea of testimony).

(3) Spicq, in the Roman tradition, must separate these leaders from and subordinate them to the Twelve and their successors (*Les Epîtres Pastorales*, p. 95) but there is nothing in the text to indicate this. Spicq's support for his argument for the superiority of the Twelve over the other charismatics is confined to 1 Cor. 14.37 which really refers to Paul's faithfulness to the tradition.

(4) Cf. Sass, *ZNW* 40(1941), pp. 29f.

(5) It is clear from the above that for Paul διάκονος and δοῦλος are more or less interchangeable.

(6) *Apostelamt und Kirche*, pp. 111f. and *ZNW* 40(1941), p. 30.

also über den βουλος hinaus besondere Eigenschaften und Vollmachten haben" is true in respect of Paul's relationship to the particular individuals named in these letters but it cannot be taken as a general principle in view of the OT prophetic background (which Sass recognises) for the prophet or servant is God's apostle, that is, God's witness or teacher as is shown clearly in, for example, IV. K.17.13.⁽¹⁾ Again, Sass's pronouncement: "Βουλος wird Rm.1.1 Gal.1.10 Phil. 1.1 zum Amtsbegriff"⁽²⁾ may be true of the individual Paul in his relationship to the churches concerned but he would be the last to call himself an 'official' as such. Paul has authority by virtue of his superior and prior knowledge of the gospel and because of his devotion and strength of character, not because he holds office as such.

The Authority of the Testimony

Ephesians, like the other documents already examined, shows that Paul regarded the message entrusted to him as the authoritative factor in his commission; it is upon this that he lays all the stress. His testimony is the word of truth, the gospel of salvation (1.13) the knowledge of which may be deepened (1.17-19, cf. Phil. 3.8) but which in its essentials must not be distorted or mutilated (4.20). It is the foundation on which the apostles and prophets are built,⁽³⁾

(1) See above p. 350, note 2.

(2) ZNW. 40(1941), p. 32.

(3) οἰκοδομεῖν is used for 'to teach' in Ac.9.31; 20.32; Ro.15.20; I Cor.8.10; 14.4 ("he that prophesieth edifieth the church"), 17; Gal.2.18; I Thess.5.11; I Pet.2.5. οἰκοδομῇ similarly is found in Ro.14.19; 15.2; I Cor.14.3,5,12; II Cor. 10.8; 12.19; 13.10; Eph.4.12,16,29.

Jesus Christ himself being the chief foundation-stone.⁽¹⁾

The first half of chapter 3 deals with Paul's stewardship of the mystery, of the gospel but his authority is secondary not only in the sense that it is a representative, derived authority (3.2) but also in that he is the servant of the gospel (3.7) and he shows the required faithfulness of the steward (I Cor.4.2) by testifying (4.17: τοῦτο οὖν λέγω καὶ μαρτύρομαι).⁽²⁾ The apostles, prophets and other teachers in 4.11 are simply those who teach the truth, they are means to an end, viz. the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the son of God on the part of all Christians. To testify ἐν Κυρίῳ (4.17) must mean to testify in the spirit of the Lord, that is, in accordance with his teaching; this is Paul's authority, and the authority of the testimony is that it is the testimony of Jesus.⁽³⁾ While the term

(1) Str/Bill. (III, p. 593) quotes Aboth RN 28(7^d) to the effect that, according to R. Eleazar ben Shammua (c. 150 AD.), the corner stone is the scholar who has learned not only the Midrash but also the Halakoth.

(2) Mackay (God's Order, p. 27) notes Paul's prophetic consciousness and reception of revelation and claims that his authority is derived from this awareness that Jesus Christ himself has called him. Alongside prophetic consciousness, however, there must be the self-authenticating truth in case the man with prophetic consciousness is really a false prophet. According to Paul the prophets are to be tested (I Cor.14.29; cf. I Jn.4.1), presumably because their prophetic call is valueless without the authentic testimony.

(3) Cf. I Cor.1.6 (2.1); II Tim.1.8; Rev.1.2,9; 12.17; 19.10; 20.4 and see Lightfoot (Galatians, p. 93, note 1) who points out that Just. Mart., Dial.c. Tryph. says that the prophets are called apostles. Chap. 75 reads: ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἄγγελοι καὶ ἀπόστολοι τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγονται οἱ ἀγγέλλειν τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀποστελλόμενοι προφῆται ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ δεδῆλωται. Λέγει γὰρ ἐκεῖ δὲ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀποστείλον με. (Migne, Patrologiae, Vol. VI. 652B).

χάρισμα is not used by the author of Ephesians, 4.7 linked with 4.11f. show that the authority in the NT Church is charismatic;⁽¹⁾ it is the authority of those who teach 'the truth as it is in Jesus'.

The apostles, prophets, etc. of 4.11 who are given by God all have a teaching function which aims at establishing the saints in the true doctrine the purity of which is being threatened by the false teachers who indulge in trickery⁽²⁾ and craftiness.⁽³⁾ The teaching to be transmitted is Christ himself, he whom the Ephesians have 'learned' (4.20); indeed it is Christ himself who, through the apostles and the others has taught them 'the truth as it is in Jesus' (4.21).

The Transmission of the Testimony

It is this truth, this name (Phil.2.9f.)⁽⁴⁾ which must at all costs be preserved, deepened (Eph.6.22), passed on and obeyed (Phil.4.9) for all other doctrine is λόγοι κένοι ,

(1) Hort (The Christian Ecclesia, p. 157): "Χάρισμα does not appear in Ephesians but ἐδωκεν associated with χάρις is exactly the ἐχαρίσατο implicitly contained in χάρισμα."

(2) Κυβεία means properly 'dice-playing'; dice-players were deemed by Rabbinic law to be ineligible as witnesses (Sanhed. 3.3).

(3) Cf. Lk.20.23; I Cor.3.19; II Cor.4.2; 11.3f; Phil.3.2; 3.18f.; Col.2.8. In Col.2.7-9 Paul contrasts the faith or μαρτύριον with the philosophy and empty craftiness of the false teachers (cf. Eph.4.15; 5.6) who teach κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων and not κατὰ Χριστόν (Col.2.8).

Philo applies φιλοσοφία to the teaching of Moses in De Mut. Nom. 39 and to the teaching of the Jewish Fathers in Leg. ad Cai. 23.33. Josephus applies the word to the three Jewish sects in Ant.18.1.2 (Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 177).

(4) Cf. Dt.28.58 where 'law' and 'Name' are closely linked.

words which do not express the truth.⁽¹⁾ The whole church is being built up by spiritual teaching on the foundation of the prophets' and apostles' doctrine, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone (Eph.2.19-22); this is being done by apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers (Eph. 4.11). The aim of all this is the perfecting of the Church's knowledge of Christ and a life of love (Eph.4.13-16). The psalms and hymns and spiritual songs referred to in Eph.5.19 (cf. Col.3.16) were no doubt an aspect of the Church's work of preserving the teaching as they were in the case of the Rabbis. In accordance with the instructions in the scriptures, fathers are enjoined to bring up their children in the teaching (παιδεία καὶ νοουθεσία)⁽²⁾ of the Lord (Eph.6.4) and the brethren are, as good soldiers, to put on the whole armour of God, viz. truth, righteousness, the preparation of the gospel of peace, faith, salvation and the word of God (Eph.6.13-17). Paul is confident that the good work (of teaching the gospel) begun in the Philippians will be perfected so that their knowledge and sense may abound yet more and more (Phil.1.6-9; cf. Col.1.9f.; 2.2f.). The Colossians are urged to remain grounded and settled in the faith 1.23; 2.6f. and not to succumb to the false teachers.

(1) Abbott, Ephesians, p. 151

(2) Νοουθεσία occurs only once in the LXX but the context gives a clear reference to its connection with the μάγιστρος who reminds men of God's torah: Sap.16.6, telling of the incident of the fiery serpents in the desert says of Israel: εἰς νοουθεσίαν δὲ πρὸς ὀλίγον ἑταράχθησαν σύμβολον ἔχοντες σωτηρίας εἰς ἀνάμνησιν ἐντολῆς νόμου σου.

(6) THE PASTORAL EPISTLESThe Nature of the Testimony

The μαρτυς-group occurs in twelve places in the Pastoral Epistles but the following three are not valuable for this study. In I.3.7 it is said that the episkopos must be 'persona grata' with people outside the church: δεῖ δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑξωθεν. The widows must have a reputation for good works: ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς μαρτυρουμένη (I.5.10). In I.5.19 the author insists that Timothy should not receive an accusation against an elder unless there are two or three witnesses (κατὰ πρεσβυτέρου κατηγορίαν μὴ παραδέχου, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων).

Διαμαρτύρεσθαι is employed in three verses. In two of these Paul gives Timothy a command: Διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων ἵνα ταῦτα φυλάξης χωεῖς προκρίματος, μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ πρόσκλησιν (I.5.21) and Διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ μέλλοντος κεῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ κήρυξον τὸν λόγον (II.4.1f.). In the other, Timothy is told to remind his people in Ephesus διαμαρτυρόμενος ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ μὴ λογομαχεῖν, ἐπ' οὐδὲν χερίσμον, ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ τῶν ἀκούοντων (II.2.14). This word, διαμαρτύρεσθαι is used almost exclusively⁽¹⁾ in the LXX for the preaching of the prophets who restate the story of God's dealings with his people and reiterate his commands in an effort to recall Israel to the LORD. In his use of διαμαρτύρεσθαι Paul is more than

(1) Apart from Gen.43.3 (= "solemnly protest"), I K.21.3 (= 'command') and Jer.39.10,44 (= 'summon witnesses').

likely to be using the Old Testament pattern exemplified clearly in IV K. 17.13-15⁽¹⁾ and to be thinking of himself and Timothy as performing the same function as the OT witnesses; Paul's testimony is made 'before God and the Lord Jesus Christ and the elect angels' and Timothy is to testify 'before the Lord' and here in II.2.14 διαμαρτυρούμενος is associated with υπομύμνησκε which means 'to point back to the original testimony';⁽²⁾ this is God's testimony given by the witness, the ἐγγάτης who 'rightly divides the word of truth'.⁽³⁾ The thought contained in διαμαρτύρεσθαι in the LXX is a compound of teaching (Ex.18.20), commanding (Ex.19.21), calling to witness (Dt.4.26), and prophetic preaching (IV K. 17.13-15). The aim of the prophets is to turn Israel to God (ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς) (II Esd.19.26; cf. I Thess.1,9; II Cor. 3.16) and to persuade Israel to walk in his ways (Zech.3.7f.) by speaking the word of the Lord (Jer.6.10). Paul uses the word in a similar way here. I.5.21 is more than a simple command; it is a command which depends for its authority on 'the words of our Lord Jesus Christ and the doctrine which is according to godliness' (I.6.3) and which has as its foundation-content the μαρτύριον which is Christ himself (I.2.6). Of this μαρτύριον Paul claims to have been made (ἐτέθην)⁽⁴⁾

(1) See above p. 350, note 2.

(2) Cf. Dahl, Anamnesis in Stud. Theol. (1947/48), pp. 69-95. esp. pp. 73-75, 80, 88, 92-93, 94.

(3) Cf. Prov. 3.1,6: ἐμῶν νομίμων μὴ ἐπιλανθάνου, τὰ δε ἔήματά μου τηρεῖτω σὴ καρδίᾳ. . . . ἐν πάσαις ὁδοῖς σου γινώσκει αὐτήν, ἵνα ὁρθοτομή τὰς ὁδοὺς σου and Prov.11.5: δικαιοσύνη ἀμώμος ὁρθοτομεῖ ὁδοὺς.

(4) Cf. Jer.1.5: προφήτην εἰς ἔθνη τέθεικά σε .

a herald and an apostle, a teacher of the Gentiles ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ (I.2.7), i.e. as a true and faithful witness! He has already referred to this ordination as a being entrusted with ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς διακονίαν (I.1.10-12), and in II.4.1 he is not so much giving Timothy a commandment as reminding him of the things which he has already been taught,⁽¹⁾ of which Timothy must in turn remind his colleagues and successors (II.2.2) and which are summed up in the phrase καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, (taking these as accusatives after διαμαρτύρομαι). The younger man's direction of those under his charge is to be that of a witness who adduces testimony to support his position; the testimony is that of the 'great cloud of witnesses' who from the beginning have spoken God's word truly and faithfully.⁽²⁾ There is no reason why διαμαρτυρόμενος ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ should not be taken as a parenthesis meaning simply 'teaching', in the manner of the man approved by God, the ἐγγάτης ἀνεπαίσχυντος who rightly divides the word of truth (II.2.15).

In the Pastoral Epistles the μαρτύριον is mentioned twice. In I.2.5f: Ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὃ δὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῦς ἰδίους εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κήρυξ; the μαρτύριον is Christ Jesus himself or his teaching about himself; he is the one mediator of the knowledge of the truth of God (I.2.4f.)⁽³⁾ and so he is both witness and testimony. This corresponds to other NT statements

(1) Cf. II Tim. 1.13.

(2) II Tim. 2.2; cf. Heb. 12.1.

(3) Cf. Leaney, The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon, p. 50; cf. Jn. 8.32.

about Jesus being the fulfilment of the law⁽¹⁾ and shows again a dependence on OT prophecy, especially the third chapter of Zephaniah where Jerusalem is called the ransomed city

(ἀπολελυτεωμένη πόλις) which received not instruction (παιδεία)⁽²⁾ whose prophets and priests profane the law (ἄσεβοῦσι νόμον). To her faithful people who are called on to receive instruction God says: ὑπόμεινόν με εἰς ἡμέραν

ἀναστάσεώς μου εἰς μαρτύριον· διότι τό κρέμα μου εἰς συναγωγὰς ἔθνων, τοῦ εἰσδέξασθαι βασιλεῖς... ὅτι τότε μεταστρέψω ἐπὶ λαοὺς γλῶσσαν εἰς γενεὰν αὐτῆς, τοῦ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι πάντας τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου, τοῦ δουλεύειν αὐτῷ ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἕνα... καὶ ὑπολείψομαι ἐν σοὶ λαὸν πρᾶον καὶ ταπεινόν, καὶ εὐλαβηθήσονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου οἱ κατάλοιποι τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ

and the city is called upon to proclaim (κήρυσσε) the good news (cf. I Cor.2.7): Περιεῖλεν Κύριος τὰ ἀδικήματά σου, λελύτρωταί (cf. ἀντίλυτρον in 2.6) σε ἐκ χειρὸς

ἔχθρων σου· βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ Κύριος ἐν μέσῳ σου, οὐκ ὄψη κακὰ οὐκέτι. (Zeph.3.1,4,8,12,14f.).⁽³⁾

It is more than likely that the writer of I.2.5ff. had this passage of Zephaniah in mind and that for him the testimony is the message of the kingship of the Lord, his demand for righteousness, his redemptive work and his promise of blessedness or doom. In the NT, apart from strictly legal passages and those where the word simply means 'one who sees', a witness is one who proclaims the word of God, the fourfold testimony which is the burden of all true prophets and indeed of Jesus himself.⁽⁴⁾

(1) E.g. Mt.3.15; 5.17; Ac.13.22; Ro.10.4.

(2) I.2.7,12 and 3.2 show that the μαρτύριον is something which is to be taught.

(3) Cf. Ps.101.13; 118.125f.; Is.49.8; 50.4; 60.17; Sir.39.16;

(4) Cf. Spicq (Les Epîtres Pastorales, p. 61): "μαρτύριον signifie proprement non la chose attestée mais le témoignage porté." Leaney (The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon, p. 52) neatly uses Tit.1.1-3 to clarify this verse.

Here in I.2.5ff. is seen the close connection between kerygma, teaching and the work of an apostle. In II.1.8-12 the gospel and the tradition are seen to be one and the same; in II.1.8 τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Κυρίου ⁽¹⁾ is identified with τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ⁽²⁾ which Jesus preached. ⁽³⁾ Paul is not ashamed of this testimony ⁽⁴⁾ and urges Timothy to be likewise, ⁽⁵⁾ an ἐργάτης or preacher/teacher who does not need to be ashamed. ⁽⁶⁾ It is because of his own submission to the testimony that he can give orders to Timothy who himself has submitted to the same authority (II.1.5f.; II.2.24). It is to the διακονία (I.1.12; cf. Ac.1.17) of the testimony fulfilled in Jesus for which Paul has been ordained by Christ as a herald etc. ⁽⁷⁾ and it is on this that his authority rests; the βούλομαι οὖν of I.2.8, however, shows how mild was his own view of that authority.

(1) Cf. I Cor.1.6; Rev.1.2,9; 12.17; 19.10 where μαρτυρία is used.
 (2) Cf. I Tim.2.6f.; II Tim.1.8,10f; Easton (The Pastoral Epistles, p. 20) takes τὸ εὐαγγέλιον as obj. gen. but still equates μαρτύριον with the gospel message as a whole; cf. Spicq: Les Epîtres Pastorales, p. 313.

(3) "In ancient Israel reproduction of another's words in one's own words and abstractions of points of view and ideas was not practised. A person's views were conveyed in his own words. Authentic statements contained the authority and power of the one who uttered them." (Gerhardsson: Memory and Manuscript, p. 130; cf. p. 131, note 1).

(4) Cf. Ro.1.15f; Mk.8.38, par. The opposite of being ashamed of the gospel is παρρησιάζεσθαι; cf. Phil.1.20. There is a strong echo here of Ps.118.46.

(5) Scott (The Pastoral Epistles, p. 92) notes the echo of Ro. 1.16 but, presumably because of his views of the authorship of the Epistles, claims that "a different turn is given to the borrowed phrase."

(6) Cf. Ps.118.46.

(7) Spicq (op. cit., p. 313) equates μαρτύριον (II Tim.1.8) with the preaching of the gospel - "Toute la vocation apostolique est de rendre ce témoignage." Daube (The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 244) resolves the difficulty raised by I Tim.4.14; 5.22; II Tim.1.6 of deciding whether the presbytery or the episkopos lays on hands, by taking this as a Rabbinic ordination and translates 4.14: "Neglect not the gift which was given thee by prophecy with 'semikhath zeqenim', due ordination, ordination conferring full authority."

A group of verses introduces μάρετες and μαρτυρεῖν the first of which is I.6.12: ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως, ἐπιλαβοῦ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, εἰς ἣν ἐκλήθης καὶ ὁμολόγησας τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν ἐνώπιον πολλῶν μαρτύρων. It is hardly likely that the μάρετες⁽¹⁾ here are simply the eye-witnesses of Timothy's baptism, or "les assistants païens 'témoins' à leur tour de la foie de Timothée".⁽²⁾ In view of Paul's use of the word-group in the Pastorals it is probable that he is referring to the prophets and elders, the teachers who attended Timothy's ordination (I.1.18; I.4.14; II.1.6), possibly people like the ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι referred to in I.3.1-13 and Tit. 1.7ff., the elders who labour in word and doctrine and who rule well (I.5.17; Tit. 1.5), the teachers who are to receive and pass on the deposit (II.2.2) and who include Paul himself (II.2.6). It may be that there is also in Paul's mind the thought of the witnesses of the OT about whom the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews wrote (12.1). They are the men who themselves have received the teaching and have made profession of the faith and are in a position of authority by virtue of their testimony.

Spicq⁽³⁾ gives six different possible interpretations of the witnesses in II.2.2 not one of which associates them with teaching. One reason for this may be that the διά is

(1) Against Strathmann who (KWB. IV, 494. 31-43) judges μάρετες (I Tim. 6.12; II Tim. 2.2) to be human witnesses of fact. Asting (*Die Verkündigung*, p. 630) makes the inexplicable statement: "Das was Timotheus von Paulus gehört hat, und was hier erwähnt wird, ist nicht die gewöhnliche christliche Verkündigung..... Es handelt sich also hier um das Weitergeben einer speziellen Überlieferung an die, die Lehrer sein sollen."

(2) Lods, *Confesseurs et Martyrs*, p. 37, note, 1.

(3) *Les Epîtres Pastorales*, p. 341.

usually translated as 'among' or 'in the presence of' but another possible meaning is that of Timothy being 'one among a number with the notion of his pre-eminence or prominence'⁽¹⁾ for, after all, he is μαρτυρούμενος (Ac.16.2). When Paul says to his young fellow-worker: Σὺ οὖν, τέκνον μου, ἐνδυναμοῦ ἐν τῇ χάριτι τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἂ ἤκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων, ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις he is relying on Timothy to preserve the testimony with which he himself had been entrusted and which he had taught, which false witnesses have corrupted⁽²⁾ but of which he is persuaded Timothy has a firm grasp.⁽³⁾ This view is strongly supported by the statements in II.3.10, 14f.⁽⁴⁾ and by the strong affinity of I.6.12 with Prov.4.1-15 especially v.13: ἐπιλαβοῦ ἐμῆς παιδείας, μὴ ἀφῇς, ἀλλὰ φύλαξον αὐτὴν σεαυτῷ εἰς ζωὴν σου⁽⁵⁾ and vv.14f. with their military reference.

The testimony of the witness is a confession similar to that witnessed by Christ Jesus who gave his testimony in the time of⁽⁶⁾ Pontius Pilate: παραγγέλλω ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πειλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν, τηρῆσαί σε τὴν ἐντολὴν ἁσπίλον. (I.6.13). The usual interpretation of this verse as referring to Jesus' testimony before Pilate pre-supposes a very limited

(1) LS. id. verb. p. 388 A.I.3.

(2) I Tim.1.6,19; 4.1ff.; 6.20f.; II Tim.1.15; 2.17f; 3.8, 4.4; cf. Tit.1.10ff.

(3) I Tim.4.6; II Tim.1.5; 2.21.

(4) "But thou hast fully known my doctrine, manner of life (ἀγωγή) (cf. I Clem.47.6 where it means 'training'), purpose, faith.....but continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of....".

(5) Cf. Baruch 4.1f.

(6) Turner's note that the phrase should be treated as an historical reference (JTS. XXVIII.III (1927), p. 271) is to the point but the matter is clinched by the precedent of Lk.3.2. See above note 1.

view of the testimony which is not reflected in the rest of the NT. The early Church certainly did not regard Jesus' statements in the judgement hall as containing the whole of his teaching, if indeed the Church had exact knowledge of what he actually said there! It appears from the Synoptics that he said very little.⁽¹⁾ John's account is fuller and gives these as words of Jesus: εἰς τοῦτο γεγέννημαι καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα μαρτυρῶ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ (18.37) but even this cannot be regarded as other than a generalisation;⁽²⁾ it is a confession, not the confession.

Finally, μαρτυρία is employed in Tit. 1.13 with reference to 'the faithful word' and 'sound doctrine' (1.9) which in turn refer back to 'the faith of God's elect' and 'the truth which is κατέυσεβειαν' (1.1) and 'the word ἐν κηρύγματι' and 'the commandment of God' (1.3). Ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀληθής may well refer to the quotation in v.12 but the whole tenor of the chapter, which is advice to a presbyter-episcopos for the preserving of the authentic gospel indicates rather the first conclusion;⁽³⁾ this is supported by the echo of Prov. 10.32: στόμα⁽⁴⁾ δὲ ἀσεβῶν ἀποστρέφεται

(1) Mt. 27.14; Mk. 15.3,5; Lk. 23.3,9.

(2) Corssen's remark (N.J.K.A. 35 (1915), p. 495) that this verse "zeigt, dass die Auffassung Jesu als eines Zeugen sich aus den Erfahrungen der Märtyrerprozesse gebildet hat und nichts anderes als ein Reflex davon ist" takes no account of the fact that the testimony in both cases is the same, that is, that Christ is, in a word, Lord and truth.

(3) Cf. Spicq, Les Epîtres Pastorales, p. 90.

(4) Gerhardsson (Memory and Manuscript, p. 81) points out that the study of the Torah is according to a typical Rabbinic mode of expression, "a work of the mouth". The above view seems preferable to that of Strathmann (KWB. IV. 505.3-5; cf. 482.9ff. which refers the μαρτυρία to the Epimenides quotation.

in v.14 which speaks of Jewish commandments of men ἀποστρεφόμενων τὴν ἀλήθειαν, whose mouths, according to v.11, it is necessary to stop (ἐπιστομίζειν).

When the Pastorals are looked at as a whole the testimony is seen to have many synonyms;⁽¹⁾ it can refer to godly edifying (I.1.4) and to the charge or commandment with the idea of transmission (παράγγελία) (I.1.5,18), it is the healthy⁽²⁾ doctrine (I.1.10; 4.6,16; 5.17; 6.1; II.3.10; 4.2;⁽³⁾ cf. Tit.1.9, II.1,7,10); it is the gospel (I.1.11; II.1.10; 2.8), it is the prophecy (I.1.18; cf. 4.14), it is the knowledge of the truth (I.2.4; II.2.15,18,25; 3.7; 4.4; Tit. 1.14). The testimony is Jesus Christ himself (I.2.6), the faith (I.1.19; 3.9; 4.6; II.3.8; 4.7), the common faith (Tit. 1.4,13), the word (I.5.17; II.4.2), healthy words (I.6.3; II.1.13), the words of our Lord Jesus Christ and the godly teaching (I.6.3), the profession (I.6.12f.),⁽⁴⁾ the commandment (I. 6.14), the deposit (I.6.20; II.1.12,14; cf. 2.2), the training (II.3.10), the kerygma entrusted to Paul (II.4.17;⁽⁵⁾ Tit.1.3) and, most importantly of all, it is the grace of God which has appeared to teach the good life (Tit.2.11f.), the charisma

(1) Spicq (op. cit., p. CLXXXI, note 1): "μαρτύριον est synonyme de κήρυγμα, διδασκαλία, εὐαγγέλιον : c'est une désignation technique du message chrétien."

(2) Cf. Prov.13.13: ὁ δε φοβούμενος ἐντολήν, αὐτός ὑγιαίνει

(3) Where διδαχή and διδασκαλία have the same meaning.

(4) Cf. Michel (KWB. V.211.1ff, esp. 8f.): ὁμολογεῖν und μαρτυρεῖν treten dicht nebeneinander auf (I Tim.6,12,13; J.1,19,20)."

(5) This verse shows clearly that the testimony of the first martyrs before the courts was a lengthy process and that the accused were allowed in their defence to make the kerygma fully known. This has not always been appreciated in spite of the report of such a trial in Ac.26, and also in Ac.6,7.

which is by prophecy (I.4.14; cf. II.1.6).⁽¹⁾ As Dibelius puts it⁽²⁾: "Bei ἀ ἡκούσας (II.2.2) ist dann an eine formulierte Zusammenfassung der Lehre zu denken, vgl. I Cor. 15.3ff; Ro.6.17."

The Content of the Testimony

The content of the testimony which Paul is so concerned that Timothy should cherish shows the usual characteristics. (a) The message states that there is only one God (I.2.5), the living God, the saviour of all men (I.4.10; Tit.1.3) who provides for all (I.6.17); he is the King of kings and Lord of lords, immortal, unapproachable, invisible (I.6.15). (b) The moral law is part of the glorious gospel (I.1.9-11),⁽³⁾ its end being love out of a pure heart, a good conscience and sincere faith (I.1.5); righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness are to be followed (I.6.11) and God's people are to be rich in good works (I.6.18; Tit.2.1-12), zealous of good works (Tit.2.14). Everyone who names the name of Christ should depart from iniquity (II.2.19) and maintain good works (Tit.3.8). (c) The redemptive action of God is often referred to: Paul says that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners (I.1.15) and that God wishes all men to be saved (I.2.4); Jesus Christ has abolished death through the Gospel of

(1) Pfeiffer (Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben. 4. 47/48. (1853), pp. 380b - 386a) has shown that the charismata are for the up-building of the congregation and that spiritual office and charisma stand very close together because they have a common origin in the Holy Spirit.

(2) Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus an Timotheus I, II. p. 189.

(3) Cf. Friedrich, KWB. II, 731f. where the point is made that Paul in Romans and Galatians never sets Law and Gospel in direct opposition to one another any more than the OT set Law and Promise against one another.

which Paul has been appointed a preacher (II.1.10f); God is the saviour whose grace brings salvation (Tit.2.11); Jesus Christ gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all lawlessness (Tit.2.14). (d) Finally, there is included teaching about the judgement of God which issues in blessedness or doom, heralded by the resurrection: Those who believe in Jesus Christ have eternal life to which they are called (I.6.12) and which God has promised before the world began (Tit.1.2). Jesus Christ has brought life and immortality to light through the gospel (by being raised from the dead (II.1.10). Paul endures all things for the elects' sake that they may also obtain the salvation (II.2.10). One of the faithful sayings is: If we be dead with him we shall also live with him, if we suffer we shall also reign with him (II.2.11). Those who say that the resurrection is past already have erred concerning the truth (II.2.18). The Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead (II.4.1). Paul is confident that there is laid up for him a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge will give him in that day and indeed to all that long for his appearing and look for the blessed hope (Tit.2.13).

The Authority of the Witnesses

Different witnesses appear in the Pastoral Epistles but all appear to have a teaching or preaching authority which depends on the more or less fixed tradition⁽¹⁾ which is the ground of their proclamation. At the same time it is clear that the authority is something which may be lost and retained (I.1.6 etc);

(1) Cf. II Thess.3.6; I Cor.15.3.

it is a spiritual gift.⁽¹⁾ Paul is an apostle, that is a carrier of the testimony 'by the command of God' and of Christ Jesus our hope (I.1.1) and yet he 'beseeches' Timothy (I.1.3; 2.1; cf. Philemon 8f.; 14,19,21) when he wishes him to do something. The word used most frequently for the Christian commandment is παραγγελία⁽²⁾ which means basically 'a transmitted message'. In Tit.1.1 Paul claims to be a servant of the Lord (like the OT prophets) and an apostle of Christ κατὰ πίστιν yet he 'arranges' (διεταξάμην) with Titus (1.5) and 'wishes' him to do things (3.8). Paul is entrusted with the gospel but he is strengthened by Christ (I.1.12; II.4.17) who depends on Paul's faithfulness in the ministry in which he has placed him. This ministry is further described as being that of a herald, an apostle and a teacher (I.2.7; II.1.11). The fact that in both cases κήρυξ precedes ἀπόστολος shows that Paul cannot be referring here to a particular office in the church which marks him off as superior to Timothy whom he instructs to herald the word, or even to John the Baptist who also was a herald (Mk.1.7). Paul certainly regards himself as God's instrument in the preserving of the deposit (II.1.12; 2.2) but the authority which he thus possesses is his only as long as he is faithful to what has been committed to him for even

(1) Rengstorff (KWB. II, 164f.) avers that διδασκαλία is used in the Pastorals "um den verpflichtenden Charakter der geschichtlichen Verkündigung betonen zu können" and also that it plays a larger part here than in the rest of the Bible because "es von Haus aus auf den Lehrer und seine Autorität zurückweist" and the author is concerned to combat a tendency on the part of his readers to break away from his own person. It must be admitted that R. realises that teacher and healthful doctrine can no more be separated than apostle and gospel but it is doubtful if teaching and gospel should be distinguished in such a clearcut way when teacher and apostle could be combined in Paul.

(2) Παραγγέλλειν is the word used for Jesus' commanding in the commissioning of the apostles (Mt.10.5; Mk. 6.8).

an apostle can become spurious (ἀδόκιμος) (I Cor. 9.27). His authority as a witness cannot simply be defined as that of one who has 'seen' the risen Lord but rather as one who is faithful to the deposit (II.3.10; 4.7). The work of testifying is urged upon Timothy also (II.1.8; II.2.14) although he was not an eye-witness of the life of Jesus or of the resurrection.

Timothy, Paul's own son in the faith, one of the leaders of the early church has an authority which comes from the same source as that of Paul, viz. the tradition which he is called to preach. His task is the edifying of the church (I.1.4) and this he must do by a form of teaching which, like Paul's, can never be regarded as having any but moral and spiritual sanctions; this is borne out by the type of verb which Paul uses in connection with it, viz: παραγγέλλειν, I.1.3), ὑποτίθεσθαι (I.4.6) and διδάσκειν (I.4-11; 6.1); cf. παρακλήσις (I.4.13).⁽¹⁾ If Timothy holds an official position it is one which does not depend primarily on the fact that an already-existing apostolic succession or ruling class of charismatics has ordained him but on the fact that he has accepted the truth of the message imparted to him and is himself aware of and obedient to God's call to himself to witness.⁽²⁾

(1) Against von Campenhausen, *KA und GV*, p. 119. On p. 122 v. C. claims on the grounds of I Tim. 3.1 that the spiritual office (ἐπισκοπή) has developed in the Pastorals into an office which may fall vacant but this is an assumption which is much weakened by a similar conception in I Cor. 12.31.

(2) Against Goguel (*L'Eglise Primitive*, pp. 60-62, 113): "Les Pastorales n'ont plus du ministère charismatique qu'un souvenir confus." Cf. *Les Premiers Temps de l'Eglise* by the same author; also against Brosch (*Charismen und Ämter*, p. 140) who quotes, without explanation, I Tim. 5.13, 19 as proof that the monarchical episcopate was always present in the Church; but Timothy could have received reports about elders in his capacity as 'moderator' without possessing superior authority. The Jerusalem Council's decision was arrived at by the whole church after discussion; cf. Harnack (*The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries*, p. 197) who says that the charisma had to be recognised by the community therefore 'election' was necessary.

Timothy is described by Paul as a deacon of Jesus Christ (I.4.6) but this must be looked on as referring to the function of the preacher or teacher. Timothy's authority is prophetic or charismatic, vide I.4.14-16 where the prophecies are the important factor; it is these on which Timothy must meditate, in which he is to be absorbed; they⁽¹⁾ are the doctrine to which he must take heed; they are the χάρισμα⁽²⁾. He has authority to lay hands on people but this cannot refer to ordination; the phrase is used elsewhere in the NT with regard to healing⁽³⁾ and could easily have that meaning here. Timothy is also described as a "man of God" (I.6.11; II.3.17),⁽⁴⁾ a title applied to Moses and many of the prophets of the OT. and thus the evangelist is brought into the true succession of those who teach the testimony. The mark of the preacher (ἐργάτης) approved by God is that he rightly divides⁽⁵⁾ the word of truth; that is to say he gives authoritative doctrinal decisions in cases where the church cannot agree.⁽⁶⁾

(1) Rather than the Lehrgabe as Behm, Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum, p. 46.

(2) I.4.14ff. with their similarity to Sap.3.10f. show that χάρισμα refers to σοφία and παιδεία, cf. Jn.4.10, Ro.1.11; I Cor.1.6f; Eph. 3.7; 4.7; II Tim. 1.6.

(3) E.g. Mt.9.18; Mk.7.32; Lk.4.40; Ac.9.12.

(4) E.g. Dt. 33.1; Jud.13.6,8 etc.

(5) ὁρθοτομεῖν is found in only two places in the LXX, in Prov. 3.6 where it is used of wisdom 'directing' one's ways and in Prov.11.5 where "righteousness traces out blameless ways." There is, however, in II Esd.18.8 a close parallel in which διαστέλλειν is used: καὶ ἀνέγνωσαν ἐν βιβλίῳ νόμου τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐδίδασκεν ἑσθρας καὶ διεστέλλεν ἐν ἐπιστήμῃ κυρίου καὶ συνῆκεν ὁ λαὸς ἐν τῇ ἀναγνώσει. Cf. Jer.10.23; Ps.118.9 and esp. Prov.12.19: χεῖλη ἀληθείᾳ κατορθοῖ ματαιοῦσαν.

(6) Spicq (Les Epîtres Pastorales, p. 352) writes: "Timothée fera cesser ses querelles par l'autorité de sa propre personne." According to the Roman view 'the authority of his own person' should mean 'the authority of his official position by virtue of his ordination' but Spicq continues, by way of expansion (?): "L'intégrité de sa conduite et de son témoignage est l'arme la plus efficace contre les faux docteurs."

The servant of the Lord (II.2.24)⁽¹⁾ has to teach in meekness, as Moses did.⁽²⁾ Paul has been faithful to the message and prays that Timothy may be the same; he uses the same word (πληροφορεῖν) for the fulfilling of Timothy's preaching as he does for that of his own (II.4.5,17).

None of the μάετις-group is used in connection with Titus, Paul's own son in the faith, but it is clear that he held much the same position in Crete as Timothy did in Ephesus. This missionary and apostle (II Cor.8.23), brother, comrade and fellow-worker of Paul is presented in the letter addressed to himself as a person of teaching and administrative authority (1.5) who can ordain elders (καθίσταται).⁽³⁾ Titus, like the elders, is to rebuke the false teachers (1.13) that they may be sound in the faith but presumably he must do this ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ (1.9; cf. 2.8) and this is confirmed by Tit.2.1,7. The basis of Titus' authority⁽⁴⁾ is the teaching which he has to speak (2.15) and affirm constantly; here and indeed wherever there is, in the NT, a struggle for authority it is never the 'line of succession' which is adduced as criterion but always the content of the testimony. Titus' authority is that of the sound doctrine. The Heretic⁽⁵⁾ is to

(1) Cf. Is.43.10; 44.1.

(2) Cf. Num.12.3.

(3) Cf. Mt.24.45; 25.21,23; Lk.12.42,44; Ac.6.3.

(4) Ἐπιταγή = commandment; cf. I Esd.1.16 etc. Ἐπιτάσσειν is used of Jacob giving charges to his sons (Gen.49.33).

(5) Αἵρετίζειν normally means 'to choose' but in I Macc. 2.19f. it is used for 'consenting to' the blasphemous commands of Antiochus: Εἰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὰ ἐν οἴκῳ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ βασιλέως ἀκούουσιν αὐτοῦ ἀποστήναι ἕκαστος ἀπὸ λατρείας πατέρων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡρετίσαντο ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ γὰρ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου πορευσόμεθα ἐν διαθήκῃ πατέρων ἡμῶν.

be entreated or interceded for (3.10), ⁽¹⁾ however, and this is in line with the statement in I Tim. that the end of the *παραγγελία* is love (I.1.5).

If the witnesses are those who preach and teach the testimony then the *πρεσβύτεροι* obviously come into this category and, according to the evidence in the Pastorals, the *ἐπίσκοποι* and *διάκονοι* are also of this order. The bishop is engaged on good work (*ἔργον*) (I.3.1); he is *θεοῦ οἰκονόμος* (Tit. 1.7), that is a preacher and teacher or witness. It is clear that the deacon has to do the same kind of work as the episkopos (cf. Stephen's activities in Ac.6 and 7) since his qualifications are similar. So, since *διάκονος* and *ὑπηρέτης* have been shown to have the same meaning it is quite possible that the deacon was a kind of assistant teacher or preacher, as it were a student assistant, the disciple of the witness, later to possess the same *παραησία ἐν πίστει*, as his 'bishop'. There are in Ephesus, besides Timothy, elders who are labouring in the word and doctrine (I.5.17) although some of them are departing from the tradition (I.1.3,7). One of the necessary characteristics of the episkopos is that he should be *διδασκτικός* (I.3.2), a term applied to 'the servant of the Lord' (II.2.24) and the deacon is to hold the mystery of the faith (I.3.9). ⁽²⁾ Timothy will be a good deacon of Christ if he reminds the brethren of the words of faith and good doctrine on which he himself has been nourished (I.4.6) and he is urged to give attendance to reading, exhortation and doctrine. The elders

(1) *Παρατεῖσθαι*, can have this meaning (LS, p. 1311. III).
 (2) Cf. Mk.4.11; I Cor.4.1; Eph. 6.19.

who labour in the word and doctrine are especially to be counted worthy of double honour (I.5.17) which shows that these men were in receipt of some kind of remuneration but not necessarily that they held any office solely by virtue of ordination. In II Tim. Paul tells the younger man to pass on the teaching to faithful men who will be able to teach others also (II.2.2); these teachers are styled simply *πιστοὶ ἀνθρώποι* without any official title, a fact which indicates that Paul's references to *episkopoi* and *diakonoi* are to functions rather than to an official status. Titus was left in Crete in order to ordain elders (1.5) who are also *episkopoi* (1.7). Here the emphasis on the teaching task of the *episkopos* is stronger than in I Tim. The false teachers with whom Titus has to contend provoke a stronger criticism from Paul (1.12f.) and they are to be rebuked sharply that they may be healthy in the faith (1.9-13). It would seem that the authority of the elder, the *episkopos* and the *diakonos* is the authority of the message he teaches and is therefore a charismatic one which lasts as long as he is faithful to the testimony.

The Authority of the Testimony

The Pastoral Epistles shed light on the authority of the testimony itself. In the first place it is absolutely exclusive and intolerant of alteration (I.1.3); it is that which builds up the believer (I.1.4); ⁽¹⁾ it is the glorious gospel of the blessed God which is a gift of grace (I.1,11,14) and it is this grace which teaches the Christian (Tit.2.11f.).

(1) Dibelius, Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus an Timotheus, I,II, pp. 141f.

The charge or instruction (παράκλησις) which Paul passes on to Timothy (I.1-18) is the same as (κατά) that which the latter received at his ordination (?) and it is by (ἐν) this prophetic or charismatic word that Timothy is to carry out his evangelistic task (I.1.18). The confession of the Christian lives in the testimony of Jesus; without his μαρτύριον there is no ὁμολογία.⁽¹⁾

The gospel which was entrusted to Paul and which he in turn passed on to Timothy is a χάρισμα given by preaching or prophecy⁽²⁾ accompanied by the laying on of hands of the presbytery of Lystra, Iconium and Derbe, i.e. of the collected presbyters,⁽³⁾ and of Paul (II.1.6). The deposit is not given into Timothy's hands as something over which he is to have control; it is something by which he must allow himself to be controlled (I.4.15f.) and which, when adhered to, will be for the salvation of the hearers and of Timothy himself.⁽⁴⁾ Such are the importance and value of the word and doctrine that they bring honour to those who study them (I.5.17). The bearer of the doctrine, whether a teacher or not, must be prepared to subordinate his own feelings rather than allow the doctrine to be blasphemed (I.6.1). Finally, the most significant statement about the authority of the wholesome words and

(1) Obendieck, Ev. Theol. Nov/Dec (1946), p. 257.

(2) Light is shed on this view of the charisma by Ro.1.11 where Paul speaks of 'imparting a charisma' and by Ro.6.23 where he speaks of the charisma of God as being 'eternal life', an expression frequently used in the LXX for the torah. This idea is extended in Jn.4.10 where the gift (δωρεά) is eternal life and further in Jn.17.2f. where the gift of eternal life is defined as 'to know God and Christ'. Cf. I Cor.1.6f; Eph.3.7.

(3) Dibelius, op. cit., p. 170. 2c.

(4) "Sie (αἱ προφητεῖαι) sind das Mittel, mit dem er seinen Gegnern widersteht, eine Quelle seiner Kraft." (Schlatter, Die Kirche der Griechen, p. 66).

the doctrine which is according to godliness is that these are the words of our Lord Jesus Christ (I.6.3) for this indicates that "the essential constituents of the Christology and ethics, as we now have them in the data of the tradition"⁽¹⁾ go back to Jesus himself.

Timothy is to stir up the charisma (II.1.6) which is given by the Holy Spirit and is to be kept by the Holy Spirit (II.1.14) and he is not to be ashamed of this testimony when faced with the possibility of suffering for it (II.1.6-8). He is to be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus who has strengthened Paul (I.1.12)⁽²⁾ and he is to commit the gospel to faithful men who will be able to teach others also (II.2.1f.). The authority of the gospel is not something which men impose on others but it is recognised by those who are given a change of mind by God (II.2.25). The testimony is a charisma but it is also something which is fixed; it is not a far-off goal of speculative research but a body of teaching (I.1.3 etc.); it is a χάρισμα which is in him (II.2.6; cf. I Jn.5.10).

It would appear that the source of Timothy's knowledge is the holy scriptures⁽³⁾ which are inspired by God, able to make men wise unto salvation through faith in Christ and are profitable for teaching, reproof, correction and instruction in righteousness that the man of God, that is, the servant of God⁽⁴⁾

(1) Riesenfeld, The Gospel Tradition, p. 28.

(2) Cf. Phil. 4.13: Ac.9.22 shows that this means 'being strengthened in the knowledge of the Gospel and its sources in the OT; cf. Eph.6.10ff.

(3) Taking παρὰ τίνων (II.3.14) as referring not to mother and grandmother, Paul and the other teachers but to ἱερεῖς

(4) ὑπάκουτα. Cf. I Tim. 4.6; 6.11; II Tim.2.24.

may be complete (II.3.14-17). The word which the episkopos is to hold fast is the faithful word⁽¹⁾ which enables him to exhort (Tit.1.9).

The Transmission of the Testimony

The deposit of the faith has been faithfully received and handed on by Paul (I.1.11,18) and Timothy and Titus must emulate him since the tradition - the living word, not the dead letter (Ro.2.29, 7.6, II Cor.3.6) - is the important thing.⁽²⁾ Greater emphasis is laid on this in the Pastorals than in earlier epistles for the obvious reason that the passing years have produced a greater number of false teachers so that the original content of the faith is more seriously threatened and the true and faithful witnesses must continue to bear the testimony with more vigour. Timothy must pass on the message to some in order that they should not teach other doctrine (I.1.3); deacons are to hold the mystery of the faith in a good conscience and must be proved and found blameless before they are allowed to act as deacons (I.3.9f.). Timothy, by reminding the brethren of the mystery of godliness (I.3.16), will prove himself a good deacon of Jesus Christ, nourished in the words of the faith and the good teaching to which he himself has paid close attention (I.4.6); he is to pass on the word and teach (I.4.11); he is to teach and exhort (I.6.2) and he is to keep the commandment with^{out} spot⁽³⁾ until the appearing of the

(1) Cf. Ps.18.8: ὁ νόμος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐπιστέφει ψυχὰς ἡ μαρτυρία κυρίου πιστή, σοφίζουσα νήπια.

(2) Cf. Grant, The Gospels, p. 13.

(3) Ἐντολή in the singular and in the plural is sometimes used in the LXX to translate ἡγήνη e.g. IV K.21.8. Ἀσπιλος is equivalent to the ἡμῶν in Ps.18.8.

Lord (I.6.14). The final injunction of the first epistle is: τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον ! - a duty which some have failed to perform. In the second epistle Timothy is urged to hold fast the form of sound words (II.1.13) and to keep the good deposit which he in turn should commit to such faithful men as will be able to teach others also (II.1.14; II.2.2).⁽¹⁾ He is to remind⁽²⁾ his people of the things he has heard from Paul (II.2.14). It is noticeable that here there is no reference to ordination or succession but simply to the preservation and transmission of the tradition. Timothy is to continue in the things he has learned (II.3.14), preach the word, reprove, rebuke, exhort with longsuffering and doctrine (II.4.2); he is to watch in all things (II.4.5),⁽³⁾ do the work of an evangelist⁽⁴⁾ and fulfil his διακονία (II.4.5).

(1) Rengstorff (KWB. II, 149f.) arguing from Tit.1.11 insists that 'the teaching' throughout the Pastorals is concerned with ethical instructions but the remainder of II Tim. 2 provides clear indications that what Timothy is to pass on is the whole gospel including the ideas of resurrection (vv.8,11,18), salvation (v.10), the moral demand (vv.19,21f.) and the sovereignty of Christ (v.12) - in fact, the word of truth in its completeness (v.15).

(2) "Le contenu central des Epîtres, et de la prédication aux communautés, était certainement le même que celui de la prédication missionnaire. Mais les fidèles connaissaient déjà le message, ils y ont été rendus participants, ils ont même insérés dans cette oeuvre divine dont le kerygma était une proclamation. C'est pourquoi justement quand il s'agit du noyau même de l'Evangile, la prédication aux communautés a été d'avantage un rappel qu'une proclamation. Ce que nous entendons donc généralement par 'Prêcher', la prédication telle qu'elle se fait à l'Eglise de façon courante, ne correspond pas sans plus au

κηρύσσειν du Nouveau Testament, mais plutôt, de biens des façons, à ἀπομνηστέειν, 'remettre en mémoire'. (Dahl: Stud. Theol. I and II. (1947/48), p. 80.

(3) Cf. Mt.24.42; 26.41; Mk.13.33-35; Ac.20.31; I Cor. 16.13.

(4) Εὐαγγελιστής is not found in the LXX but other forms of the word-group are clearly associated with 'good news' e.g. II K.18.20ff; IV K.7.9. Εὐαγγελίζομαι is found in three of the Psalms where it is associated with 'righteousness' (39.10), 'the word' (67.12) and 'salvation' (95.2).

In Titus there is a repetition of the same emphasis on the handing on of the truth. The elders are to be ordained as episkopoi, are to be like the faithful and wise servant in Jesus' parable whom his master has set over the household (Mt. 24.45; cf. Eph.2.19), to hold fast the faithful word as they have been taught and by sound doctrine exhort and convince the unruly (1.9f.),⁽¹⁾ that is, those who have swerved from the tradition (1.1.6). Titus is to speak the words that are "in keeping with" (NEB) healthy teaching (2.1) and be uncorrupt in doctrine (2.7); the aged men are to be healthy in the faith and the aged women likewise that they may be teachers of good things (2.2-5). Finally, Titus must be constantly and strongly affirming the gospel and command of God (3.8).

Conclusion

In all the Pauline Epistles there is an insistence that the witness, the Church leader, whether official or otherwise, has a teaching authority which is based on adherence to and obedience of the testimony of Christ or God. Paul claims no other authority for himself and he will acknowledge the authority of other teachers only in so far as their doctrine

(1) Ἀνυπότακτοι : Cf. I Thess.5.14: νουθετεῖτε τοὺς ἀτάκτους II Thess 3.6: στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἣν παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν and I Clem.42.2: ἐγένοντο (οἱ ἀπόστολοι) εὐτάκτως ἐκ θελήματος Θεοῦ
(Having received the gospel from the Lord Jesus Christ and he having been sent from God.).

and behaviour are in accordance with the gospel. The witness of the resurrection, the witness of God is a teacher of the resurrection, a doctrine which takes on its full meaning when seen in the light of Jesus' resurrection, death and teaching activity. Paul's references to testifying show a strong likeness to the teaching of Jesus' parables about the faithful steward who is to administer what is entrusted to him by his lord.

The gospel or testimony is a grace-gift; it is characterised by freedom but nevertheless it has a definite content which may be described as being basically that of the OT but fulfilled in Christ. It is a possession which is to be cherished and passed on unaltered. The authority of this testimony does not lie simply in the fact that the risen Christ has appeared in some way or other to the original teachers but in the fact that it has been believed by those to whom it has been proclaimed (I Cor. 3.5), because they have seen it as the truth of God (I. Thess. 2.13).

Even at the time of the writing of the early Epistles there was a concern about correct tradition being defended against erroneous doctrine but possibly greater emphasis is laid on this matter in the Pastorals because of the understandably greater number of false teachers in the growing Church.

CHAPTER XIV

TESTIMONY IN THE GENERAL EPISTLESOF JAMES, PETER AND JUDE

(1) JAMES

The Epistle of James contains only one instance of the μάργος-group, in 5.3 where it is said of the rich men's gold and silver: ὁ ἴος αὐτῶν εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῶν ἔσται καὶ φάγεται τὰς σάκεας ὑμῶν ὡς πῦρ . Here, μαρτύριον has its basic meaning of 'reminder', "a visible sign and symbol of the real state of the case."⁽¹⁾

The writer of this letter adheres to the same ideas about teaching as his fellow-writers in the NT. For him σοφία is a gift of God (1.5) and 'the engrafted word' of 1.21 has affinities with the Epistle of Barnabas 1.2: οὕτως ἐμφυτον τῆς δωρεᾶς πνευματικῆς χάριν εἰλήφατε .⁽²⁾ While the teachers of Judaism were held in high esteem the Church is not to hold the faith with respect of persons (2.1; cf. 3.13). The readers are advised that not many of them should aspire to the position of teacher or wise man for the temptations are great and there is one law-giver and so no man can really judge another (4.12).

The last two verses of the letter show that the idea of the witness as teacher is not far from James' mind for 5.19f. states: "If any of you err from the truth and one convert him

(1) Ropes, St. James, ICC, p. 286.

(2) Cf. op. cit., pp. 172f.

let him know that he...shall save a soul from death and shall hide a multitude of sins." This is reminiscent of Prov. 14.25: ῥύσεται ἐκ κακῶν ψυχὴν μάργος πιστός, ἐκκαίει δὲ ψεύδη δόλιος. He is the ψυχικός (Gal. 6.1), the man who is upheld by God's πνεῦμα ἡγεμονικόν, πνεῦμα εὐθές, πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, the man who has a πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον who will teach the lawless and will turn the profane to God (Ps.50.15-20).

(2) PETER AND JUDE

The Nature of the Testimony

In I Pet.1.9ff. the author speaks of "the theme of salvation" (NEB) which the prophets have enquired into and searched.⁽¹⁾ Prophets also foretold the grace or gospel which speaks of the Cross and Resurrection of Christ and this prophecy was effected by the working of the Spirit of Christ testifying beforehand (προμαρτυρόμενον) in them.⁽²⁾ This testifying or διακονία (v.12) had the same subject-matter as that reported by those who had evangelised the readers of the epistle by the same Holy Spirit. The ἄγγελοι who wish to look into this teaching are the teachers themselves (cf. Sir.14.20-23,

(1) Ἐξεζητήσαν and ἔξηραύνησαν are a parallelism as in Ps.118.2: μακάριοι, οἱ ἐξερευνῶντες τὰ μαυστρία αὐτοῦ ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ ἐκζητήσουσιν αὐτόν. Cf. vv.34, 69, 115 and 129: θαυμαστὰ τὰ μαρτύρια σου· διὰ τοῦτο ἐξηρεύνησεν αὐτὰ ἡ ψυχὴ μου. In Prov. 2.1-5 it is ἔησις ἐμῆς ἐντολῆς, σοφία and σύνεσις the subject of the νοουθετήσις, the ἐπιγνώσις of God which are to be searched diligently for like treasures. And yet γνῶσις is the gift of God (v.6) and he treasures up σωτηρίαν for them that walk uprightly (v.7). Ἐκζητεῖν is employed likewise in the LXX in connection with the μαρτύρια e.g. Ps.24.10: πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ κυρίου ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθεια τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν τὴν διαθήκην αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτοῦ; cf. 26.4; 77.5,7; (NB in Ps. 118.10 'seeking out the Lord himself' is equated with 'seeking his commands') 118.22; 145f; also relevant are 118.155, Prov: 27.21a; cf. Sap. 39.1,3.
(2) Cf. Ep. Barnab. 5.6.

Prov.13.17f. which show that ἀγγελος may be used for a teacher who gives παιδεία⁽¹⁾. The testimony of OT and NT teachers is also called ἀποκάλυψις as in Rev.1.1.⁽²⁾ Selwyn sees a difficulty in the present tense φερόμενην⁽³⁾ (I.1.13) but his explanations are unconvincing. The grace of the gospel has been brought - it has been reported and announced (v.12) and ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ meaning 'to hope in a present reality' is not uncommon in the LXX.⁽⁴⁾ The people who testify are obedient to the testimony, they serve it (I.1.12). Their authority is a spiritual authority in the sense that it depends on the testimony to which the Spirit is a fellow-witness and it also depends on whether or not the hearers are obedient (I.1.14) to this gospel.

In I.5.1 the author describes himself as a fellow of the elders and a witness (μάρτυς)⁽⁵⁾ of the suffering of

(1) See below pp. 441f.

(2) There is no particular reason for taking ἐν ἀποκαλύψει (I.1.7) as referring to the future; ἐν may mean 'by'.

(3) (The First Epistle of Peter, p. 140). Selwyn thinks φερόμενην ought to be fut. tense because he thinks of the revelation of Christ as being a future event occurring in testimony or kerygma. Cf. Bigg, St. Peter, ICC, p. 39.

(4) e.g. Ps.30.25; 77.7: ἵνα θῶνται ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, τὴν ἐλπίδα αὐτῶν καὶ μὴ ἐπιλάθωνται τῶν ἔργων τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ἐκζητήσουσιν. Cf. 145.5; 32.22 and many others.

(5) Strathmann (KWB. IV, 499.3ff.) is correct in denying a technical, martyrological meaning but his reference to Peter's personal experience of suffering is not convincing. Schlatter's view (Der Märtyrer, p. 309, note 94) is correct: "Petrus ist freilich 'der Zeuge'.....mit Wort und Tat durch sein Apostolat und nicht erst durch seine Kreuzigung." Cf. Munck: Petrus und Paulus, p. 17 and note 19. Cranfield (The First Epistle of Peter, p. 109) takes this as a simple reference to Peter's eye-witness memories of Jesus' sufferings on earth, Cf. Zahn, (Introduction, Vol. 2. p. 147 and pp. 155f., note 9) who takes μάρτυς = eye-witness.

Christ.⁽¹⁾ and also a companion, partner⁽²⁾ of the glory⁽³⁾ destined⁽⁴⁾ to be revealed, thus linking his own testimony with that of the Holy Spirit in the OT prophets. It is difficult to imagine that he uses the term *μέγας* to refer to a more exalted and authoritative position in the church;⁽⁵⁾ had this been the case no doubt it would have been mentioned first. Strathmann⁽⁶⁾ draws attention to the very close linking of the

(1) Von Campenhausen (*Idee*, p. 64): "Die Leiden Christi bezeichnen jetzt die brutalen gerichtlichen Verfolgungen und Unterdrückungen der Christen als solche, die in der Nachfolge und nach dem Vorbild Christi getragen werden müssen." But there is an interesting passage in *The Acts of Peter, Bishop of Alexandria* (circa 300AD) which supports the view that I Pet. 5.1 refers to Peter's teaching and not to his personal experience. It is related that Peter's executioner could not look him in the face through fear and trembling and prayed to St. Mark thus: "Thou evangelist of the Saviour; thou witness of his passion." (*Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, Vol. XIV, pp. 283f.)
 (2) *κοινωνός* means 'companion' or 'partner' rather than 'partaker'; cf. Esth. 8.12n; Mal. 2.14; Prov. 28.24; Sir. 6.10; 41.18f; 42.3; Is. 1.23.

(3) The glory is the new wisdom or gospel of God which is glorious (*λαμπρά*) and never fades away (*ἀμάρταντος*) according to Sap. 6.12; cf. I Pet. 1.4 where the message is called *κληρονομία* and I Pet. 5.4 where it is the crown of glory.

(4) *μελλούσης* means 'destined' (LS.p.1099.I.a) and *ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι* refers to what has taken place, i.e. Peter is a partner of his fellow-elders in the glory which has been revealed according to destiny (cf. 1.10).

(5) With Schlatter, *The Church in the New Testament Period*, p. 35 Schlatter's definition (p.36) that "a person becomes a 'witness' when a fact has to be established before a judge in order that the demand of justice may be fulfilled" is yet another example of a misleading emphasis on the legal aspect of the word-group. The Biblical use of the term is dictated, except in obvious legal situations, by the basic, etymological meaning of 'calling to mind'.

(6) *KWB* IV, 498, note 56.

two titles but draws no conclusion, although the obvious one is that the presbyters are witnesses also - as they were in Ephesus (Ac.20.28). Wand⁽¹⁾ regards the verse as "a delicate hint of the writer's higher rank since to have been an eye-witness of Christ's earthly life was a qualification for apostleship", a judgement based on the assumption that μάετος here means an eye-witness. There is no difficulty about this phrase if the word is taken to mean simply a teacher or preacher⁽²⁾ and this view is supported by the reference to the prophetic testimony concerning the suffering of Christ and the glory that should follow (1.11). Thus the μάετος gains his authority, if any, not because of his eye-witness experience⁽³⁾ or because of his own suffering⁽⁴⁾ but simply by virtue of his message,⁽⁵⁾ Ποιμάνετε (1.5.2) is another indication

(1) The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 122; cf. Selwyn, The First Epistle of Peter, p. 228.

(2) Against Bigg, St. Peter, ICC, p. 186: "The term is best taken here of 'an eye-witness' as in Acts i.8, 22, ii.32, iii.15, v. 32, x. 39,41. In this sense μάετος is practically equivalent to ἀπόστολος." cf. pp. 30f.

(3) Asting's comment is that the eye-witness point of view is there but is not dominant; Peter is eye-witness of what is to be the highest point of the revelation - "Dadurch ist er zum Verkünder vom Christi Leiden gewacht worden, d.h. zum Träger der Offenbarung die Christus brachte." (Die Verkündigung, p. 639)

(4) M. Barth, Der Augenzeuge, p. 283 and Cullmann, Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, p. 86.

(5) Moffatt, The General Epistles, p. 161: "Witness means not only an eye-witness, but one who witnesses to what Christ suffered, i.e. to their^(sic) significance and reality." Cf. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. 5.28.11, where the phrase is equated with ὁμολογητής (5.28.8).

that the elders and witnesses are teachers,⁽¹⁾ if, as must have been the case, the writer was aware of this usage in Jer. 3.1,3,15; Ezek. 34.23 and Sir.18.13. Ἐπισκοποῦντες (I.5.2) is accepted by Selwyn⁽²⁾ without comment although the earliest known reading is Cod. A, Cranfield would omit it⁽³⁾ with the observation that it adds nothing to what is already included in the meaning of ποιᾶναι. The warning about mercenary behaviour is in line with the frequent accusations against false teachers levelled by NT writers.⁽⁴⁾ In I.5.12 Ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν is used to describe the work of the witness in testifying that the gospel is the true grace of God in which the readers are exhorted to stand.⁽⁵⁾

From the foregoing it may be concluded that the testimony of this author, like that of the other NT writers, is of the same order as that of the OT prophets for as they testified and ministered (I.1.11f.), so he evangelises (I.1.25), exhorts, I.5.1,12⁽⁶⁾ and testifies (I.5.12). The testimony is also called

(1) Cf. Nauck (ZNW. 48(1957), p. 220) who points out that "Die Didache sieht in den kirchlichen Amtsträgern, den Bischöfen und Diakonen, die Nachfolger der urchristlichen Propheten (Did.15.1)" and his significant quotation from Cahiers Archéologiques V.(1951), esp. pp. 98, 107,118, concerning the Old-Syrian tradition that Bishop and Presbyters were grouped, not round the altar but round the place in which scripture was read and expounded.

(2) The First Epistle of Peter, p. 230.

(3) The First Epistle of Peter, p. 111.

(4) Cf. Aboth 4.5; Bek. 4.6.

(5) Bigg. St. Peter, ^{and St. Jude} ICC, p. 196, but see above p. 46, note 1. Cf. Asting. Die Verkündigung, p. 639.

(6) Selwyn, The First Epistle of Peter, p. 262 takes the prophets of v.10 to be the NT prophets on the grounds that seeking and searching are not easily identified with what we know of the activities of the OT prophets but against this may be set note 1 on page 397 above.

salvation (I.1.9f.); grace (I.1.10, 4.10 where it is also called a charisma; I.5.12; Jude 4); revelation (I.1.12); διακονία (I.1.12; 4.10f.) and gospel (I.4.17); the truth (I.1.22; cf. II.1.12); the word of God (I.1.23); γνῶσις (I.3.7; cf. II.1.2f.; 5f, 8.); ἐπίγνωσις (II.2.20); οἰκονομία (I.4.10); λόγια Θεοῦ (I.4.11); the faith (I.5.9; Jude 3.); things pertaining to life and godliness (II.1.3, 6; the word of prophecy (II.1.19f; cf. 3.2); the way of truth (II.2.2); the straight way (II.2.15); the way of righteousness (II.2.21); the holy commandment (II.2.21), of the apostles of the saviour (II.3.2) and grace and knowledge (II.3.18).

The Content of the Testimony

The testimony spoken by Peter is that common to all the documents so far examined. The most direct expression of it is in I Pet. chap. 1 where the main emphasis is on the redemptive activity of God contrasted with the promise of glory summed up in the resurrection and repeatedly referred to as the sufferings of Christ and the coming glory (I.1.2f., 7, 11, 17, 19; 4.13f; 5.1, 10). But (a) the suffering was fore-ordained by the Father-God who raises the dead (I.1.20f.), whose word lives for ever (I.1.23, 25) and (b) the salvation-preaching is never divorced from the command of God that men should obey his moral law; (c) the readers are chosen to sanctification and obedience (I.1.2) and are to be holy in all their life (I.1.14ff.) and love one another with a pure heart fervently (I.1.22); (d) They have a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead to an inheritance in heaven (I.1.3f.).

(a) Elsewhere reference to the creative power of the only God, shared by Jesus the Messiah, is found in I.1.20; 3.22; 4.19; 5.6; II.1.3, 17; 3.5. (b) The moral law is obviously part of the new torah taught by the apostles (II.2.21) as is shown

by I.2.1,11-22; 3.1-17; 4.1-9, all summed up in II.1.3. The face of the Lord is against the doers of evil; God has called Christians not only to glory but also to virtue (II.1.3-9). The false teachers are condemned in II Pet. because, unlike Noah, the δίκαιοσύνῃς κήρυξ (II.2.5), they condone moral laxity (II.2.10,13-15,18-22; 3.11; Jude 4.8). (c) The redemptive suffering of Jesus on the cross is referred to in I.2.21,24, 3.18, 4.1,. (cf. Jude 5 which refers to the Exodus as a parallel to the salvation which is through Christ.) (d) God's promise of glory to those who believe and obey finds its fullest expression in the resurrection of Jesus and the hope it gives; the reverse side of that hope being the doom reserved for the disobedient (II.2.1-12). The resurrection of Jesus gives promise of the incorruptible, unfading inheritance reserved in heaven for the elect (I.1.3f.), the glory which should follow. The elect have been called out of darkness into God's glorious light (I.2.9) which is his eternal glory (I.5.10) to inherit a blessing (I.3.9; cf. Mt.25.34). Both author and readers look for a new heaven in which righteousness dwells (II.3.13).

The Authority of the Witnesses

In the Epistles of Peter and Jude the witness has a teaching authority resting on the authority of the message which he proclaims. That this is so receives support from the following: Peter styles himself an apostle or servant of Jesus Christ (I.1.1, II.1.1) and thus sets himself under the authority of

Jesus and his message. Selwyn⁽¹⁾ favours the view that the disciples, "especially the Twelve, are authoritative because of their eye-witness experience." He quotes Hoskyns' The Fourth Gospel, p. 97: "Those who have not seen and yet have believed are what they are because there once were men who believed because they actually did see (xx.29)" and this is allowable as long as it does not give the impression that the second 'because' means 'what'; it was not because Peter was an eye-witness of Jesus' sufferings that he could call himself μαρτυρ but because, having seen them, he had been given grace by the Holy Spirit to 'see' in them the redemptive activity of God which gives them significance.

The OT prophets are witnesses in the sense that they relay the testimony of the Holy Spirit who testifies in advance (i.e. in the OT) to the suffering and glory (I.1.11). They themselves are servants (διδάσκοντες) (I.1.12) of the revelation as are also the men who have evangelised the readers, who report the same things by the inspiration of the same testifying Spirit sent down from heaven (I.1.12). The authority possessed by prophets and evangelists alike is the same; it is a spiritual authority inseparable from the revelation of the Spirit (I.1.11).

The readers of I Peter are also seen (2.9f.) to be witnesses in the sense of Is. 43.10, 12, being identified with Israel in terms taken from Ex. 19.4f.⁽²⁾ and Is. 43.20f.⁽³⁾ Speaking

(1) The First Epistle of Peter, pp. 27-33.

(2) Αὐτοὶ ἐμαρτύρησαν ὅσα πεποίηκα τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις, καὶ ἀνέλαβον ὑμᾶς ὡς ἐπὶ πτερύγων αἰμάτων καὶ προσήγαγον ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἑμαυτόν. καὶ νῦν εἰάν τις ἀκοῇ ἀκούσῃ τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς καὶ φυλάξῃ τὴν διαθήκην μου, ἐξοσθῇ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔθνων.

(3) τὸ γένος μου τὸ ἐκλεκτόν, λαόν μου, ὃν περιποίησάμην. (NB. Cf. IV Macc. 10.10 where ἀρετὴ is equivalent to the torah.)

(the word of God) is one of the gifts of the manifold grace of God and anyone who speaks is to do so $\omega\varsigma$ λόγια Θεοῦ, that is, as a witness who bears the μαρτυρία. The gift is to be ministered by the witnesses as by good stewards (καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι) (I.4.10), an echo of Paul's descriptions of himself as one who had been entrusted with the stewardship of the Gospel (I. Cor. 9.17), of the grace of God (Eph.3.2), of the mysteries (I Cor. 4.1); cf. Tit.1.7 where the ἐπίσκοπος is to be as a steward of God. This conception of the stewardship of the ministry goes back to Jesus himself (Lk.12.41-48; 16.1-13). The doctrine of the original teachers of the readers is contrasted with that of the false teachers in II Pet. It is the content of each which is contrasted and the author makes no attempt to argue any break in 'apostolic succession';⁽²⁾ it is by the knowledge of God and of Jesus that these Christians are to have grace and peace multiplied to them (II.1.2). In II. cc. 2 and 3 it is the turning away from the way of truth taught by the apostles to the heresies of the false teachers which is condemned, not the fact that they are not in the line of succession.

The work of the author of II Peter, like that of the other NT writers is to remind his readers of the things they already know (cf. Jude 5, I Jn. 2.7) and in which they are established (1.12) for it is the present truth (ἡ παρῶσα ἀλήθεια). This is also spoken of as 'the words spoken before by the holy prophets and the commandment of the apostles' (3.2).

(1) Λογία is synonymous with μαρτυρία in Ps.118.11,14 etc.
 (2) Cf. Bigg, St. Peter, ICC, p. 250.

The author of II Peter, by the use of ἐπόπτης in 1.16 is not necessarily dependent on the language of the Greek mystery religions⁽¹⁾ nor is he claiming simply to be an eye-witness⁽²⁾ of the events in question.⁽³⁾ M. Barth avers: "Sie haben das prophetische Wort 'fester' (βεβαιότερον) da sie schon Augenzeugen seines Inhalt waren"⁽⁴⁾ but the source of their authority is their faith which was stronger after Jesus passed from their sight! The source of the ideas and much of the language here is the LXX where ἐπόπτης is equivalent to ἐπίσκοπος, used mainly of God⁽⁵⁾ and where μάργυς is also found as the equivalent of ἐπίσκοπος as in Sap.1.6. Thus all three words may be used interchangeably and may refer to the one who sees, oversees or watches over, i.e. guards. II.1.16 carries echoes of the great similarity of the OT salvation effected at the Exodus and its fulfilment wrought on the cross of Jesus and is illuminated by Dt.11.1-7: καὶ φυλάξῃ τὰ φυλάγματα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα καὶ γνώσεσθε σήμερον ὅτι οὐχὶ τὰ παῖδιά ὑμῶν, ὅσοι οὐκ οἶδασιν οὐδὲ εἶδον τὴν παιδείαν κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ σου καὶ τὰ μεγαλεῖα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν χεῖρα τὴν κραταιάν καὶ τὰ σημεῖα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ τέρατα αὐτοῦ,

(1) Selwyn, The First Epistle of Peter, pp. 305-311; Michaelis. KWB. V. 375.30ff.

(2) Michaelis. KWB. V, 348.13ff. sees the emphasis on eye-witness as a proof that this letter is not authentic but it can be no less so than other Biblical documents which speak of seeing Christ metaphorically.

(3) Cf. Stählin. KWB. IV, 796, note 154: "Im NT ist Autopsie Korrelatbegriff von Logos (vgl. Lk.1.2 auch I Jn.1.1); cf. p. 788. 30-34." Bigg, St. Peter, p. 266, is to all intents and purposes correct in identifying ἐπόπτης and αὐτόπτης.

(4) Der Augenzeuge, p. 177.

(5) Esther 5.1a; II Macc.3.39; 7.35, III Macc.2.21; cf. IV Macc. 5.13, where ἐπόπτικος = guardian. Ἐφορεῖν has the same sense in, for example, Ps.112.6; 137.6.

ὅσα ἐποίησεν ἐν μέσῳ Αἰγύπτου ὅτι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ
 ὑμῶν ἑώρακαν πάντα τὰ ἔργα κυρίου τὰ μεγάλα, ὅσα
 ἐποίησεν ὑμῖν σήμερον .⁽¹⁾ It is thus possible to
 regard the ἐπόπται τῆς μεγαλειότητος as the spiritual
 successors of the Israelites who 'saw' the wonders and glory
 of God (Dt.4.9, Num.14.22) but who saw no likeness (Dt.4.12).⁽²⁾
 In the fulness of time the NT ἐπόπται have discerned the glory
 of God in the historical event which is Jesus, his person and
 work. The truth testified by the author and his fellows is
 rooted in historical facts as was that of the OT witnesses; it
 is not a fabricated myth dressed up in πλαστοῖς λόγοις (II.
 2.3)⁽³⁾ like the pagan 'mysteries'. The contrast is between
 σεσοφίσμενοι μῦθοι and ἡ μαρτυρία⁽⁴⁾ κυρίου
 σοφίζουσα νήπια of Ps.18.8.⁽⁵⁾ II.1.16 does not then
 refer to the Transfiguration but to the whole Incarnation al-
 though v. 18 does refer to the former as a special item of the
 latter. But that the ἐπόπται are not simply claiming to
 be eye-witnesses of historical facts is emphasised by v.19:
 "We have also a more sure confirmation in the prophetic word."
 If authority is derived from having been an eye-witness of
 historical events⁽⁶⁾ then a prophetic word can hardly be said

(1) Cf. Sir.17.1-13, esp. vv.1,7-9,11-13.

(2) The eyes of the second generation who entered Canaan are said to have 'seen' what the Lord did in Egypt!! Josh.24.7.

(3) Cf. Baruch 3.23 where it is said of the μυθολόγοι: ὁδὸν τῆς σοφίας οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οὐδὲ ἐμνήσθησαν τὰς τειβούς αὐτῆς.

(4) Stählin (KWB. IV, 791-796) has shown the importance of the contrast between μῦθος and ἀλήθεια (i.e. the gospel or testimony) in the Pastorals and II Peter.

(5) Cf. Ps.118.97-99; Prov.16.17. Miegge (Gospel and Myth, p.104) contrasts with the myths 'the words of faith and of good doctrine' of I Tim.4.6 (cf.v.7).

(6) As Schlier, KWB. I, 602.28-30: "βέβαιος ist ein λόγος hier also nicht insofern als er Einsicht gewährt, sondern insofern als er sich in einem Geschehen als begründet erweist." S. quotes Heb.2.2 but this support is unsatisfactory unless the 'event' implied here is the giving of the law to Moses by God 'in person'!

to be βεβαιότερος but if the criterion is the self-authenticating truth of what is said then v.19 makes sense (cf. II.3.2). The writer of Ps.118 called on God (v.28) to strengthen (βεβαιόσιν) him by his words (which are equated with νόμος and μαρτύρια in the same section) but the Christian teachers have a more strengthening prophetic word, the word of Jesus himself, the word which is Jesus, the present truth. Their authority rests on their message, the prophetic word which is surer than the OT torah.

False prophets and false teachers are equated in II.2.1, the false ones being recognisable as such because their teaching is according to private interpretation. These false teachers are the spiritual successors of the idol-worshippers of Is. cc.43,44 against whom Israel is to direct the true testimony.⁽¹⁾ Noah is used by the writer as an example of the true prophet, the δικαιοσύνης κήρυξ over against the false teachers, the latter being described as 'wells without water'. This is a thought which is close to that of Jeremiah concerning the backsliders who have forsaken God, the fountain of living waters and have hewed for themselves cisterns that can hold no water (Jer.2.13).⁽²⁾

{¹} Cf. Sap. chapters 13,14, esp. 14.22-29.

{²} Jer.2.13; Prov.13.14, cf. Jesus' words to the woman at the well about his 'living water' and her activity (μαρτυροῦσθς) after she has received it.

The Authority of the Testimony

When the authority of the testimony itself is examined it is discovered to be that of the teaching of the Holy Spirit (I.1.11f.) which must be answered by the obedience of faith in the believer (I.1.22). The teaching or testimony is a gift of God's grace; it is the true grace of God in which the author can urge his readers to stand (I.5.12) and so it may be termed a sort of static charisma. That the faith is a fixed body of doctrine is stressed in II.1.1 although it is connected with the OT prophets who were moved by the Holy Spirit (II.1.19-21); it is called the way of truth which shows that it must have had a definite form and content and yet the readers are urged to grow in grace, which means that they are to grow in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Jude also exhorts his readers ἐπαγωνίσασθαι τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει (v.3), which grace the false teachers have turned into impiety (ἀσέλγεια) (v.4).⁽¹⁾

The Transmission of the Testimony

The authors of these three books clearly regard the testimony as the source of their own authority and that of all the witnesses and therefore it is to be expected that they will be anxious that their readers should guard it closely and transmit it faithfully. The readers of I Peter are facing a testing of their faith and the writer hopes that it will stand up to the test (1.7), that they will grow in grace (2.2), be

(1) Ἀσέλγεια = wantonness; cf. Sap.14.22,24,26 and all the accusations levelled by the prophets against Israel for her unfaithfulness to the Lord her husband, e.g. Hos. chapter 2 and Jer.31.32 (Heb.).

built up a spiritual house to offer up spiritual sacrifices (2.5) and show forth the virtues (ἀρεταίς) - the work of the witness of Jahweh (Is.43.21; cf.42.12); they should be ready always to give an answer to every man who asks a reason of the hope that is in them (3.15), they are to be good stewards of the charismata of God (4.10) and obedience to the gospel must come before any consideration of personal safety (4.14-19). The elders are to feed the flock (that is, presumably, by teaching). The devil being resisted steadfast in the faith (5.9) the writer prays that God may make them perfect (that is, in knowledge (5.10)). His own letter testifies that the grace or gospel in which they are to stand is true (5.12).

The writer of II Peter urges his readers to add the Christian virtues to their faith that they may not be unfruitful in their knowledge of Jesus Christ (1.8). He stresses his own eagerness to keep fresh their memory of the faith (1.12-15; 3.1f.)⁽¹⁾ and his desire that they should pay heed to the prophetic testimony (1.19). They must be specially on their guard against the false teachers who render false testimony (2.1) and because of whom the truth will be blasphemed (2.2). Παράδοσις is used by this writer to denote the handing down of the tradition of the way of righteousness, the holy commandment (2.21). Some people will doubt the coming

(1) Cf. above p. 368, note 1.

salvation but the word of the prophets and apostles must be clung to for the day of the Lord will surely come (3.1-10). Finally, he exhorts them to stand fast to the things they know and to grow in grace and the knowledge of Christ.

Jude also lays some stress on the tradition, calling on the saints to contend (ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι)⁽¹⁾ for the true doctrine against the false teachers who are denying it.

Conclusion

The General Epistles of James, I and II Peter and Jude show the same dependence of the μαρτεία -concept on the OT testimony of God delivered by the prophets. The witnesses or teachers have an authority which is inseparable from the revelation of the Spirit. Here also the doctrine of the original teachers, the teaching of the Holy Spirit is contrasted with that of the false teachers who are disobedient and so stumble at the word, the way of truth. It is noteworthy that it is the content of the testimony which is used by the orthodox as a criterion of authority, not an 'apostolic succession'.

(1) Like the seven brethren, the champions (ἀγωνισταί) of virtue (IV Macc.12.15; cf.17.11ff.) who upheld the torah by their μαρτεία (IV Macc.12.16 (A reading) see p. 82, note 1 above); 16.16(διαμαρτεία).

CHAPTER XV

TESTIMONY IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWSThe Nature of the Testimony

The Epistle to the Hebrews contains 13 occurrences of the μαρτυρῶν-group, one of which is concerned with the demand of the Jewish law for two or three witnesses in a legal case (10.28). Of the others, one refers to the testimony added by God to that of his witnesses in the form of signs and wonders, divers miracles and distributions of the Holy Spirit at his own will (2.4); seven are concerned with the testimony of the scriptures (2.6; 7.8,18; 10.15; 11.4 (twice), 5); one presents Moses as a faithful servant of God for a testimony of the things about to be spoken (3.5);⁽¹⁾ the remaining three deal with the testimony of the heroes of faith (11.2,39; 12.1).

In 2.4 God is said to be a co-witness (συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος) with the Lord and with those who had heard Jesus and who had confirmed his words to the author and his fellow-teachers, that is their leaders who spoke to them the word of God and whose faith they are to imitate (13.7,17).⁽²⁾ The subject of the

(1) This is obviously a quotation from Num.12.7 and so 'the words about to be spoken' cannot refer to the distant Christian revelation but to the next verse (Num.12.8: στόμα κατὰ στόμα λαλήσω αὐτῷ ἐν εἶδει καὶ ἀνιγμάτων). The testimony is the word of God and there is here no question of eye-witness testimony for Moses "endured as seeing the invisible." Moffatt (Hebrews, ICC, p. 43) writes: "The difficult phrase εἰς τὸ μαρτυρεῖον τῶν λαληθησομένων means, like 9.9, that the position of Moses was one which pointed beyond itself to a future and higher revelation" but the contrast is not primarily between the testimony of Moses and that of Jesus but between their respective relationships to God. There is no justification in view of Dt. 31 and 32, for confining the testimony to the commands, especially those of a legal kind, which Moses received in the tabernacle from God, as Strathmann, KWB, IV, 510.22-28.

(2) Cf. Did. 4.1.

testimony is the greater salvation, the new torah⁽¹⁾ which has been announced by Jesus and his disciples.⁽²⁾ Jesus and his disciples must here be regarded as witnesses or teachers of the new torah to which God himself also testifies by signs, wonders, miracles and gifts of grace as he testified at the time of the giving of the Mosaic law.⁽³⁾ This passage is reminiscent of another in the Mishnah where Rabbi Dosethai ben Yannai, in the name of the 2nd. Century Rabbi Meir, quotes Dt. 4.9 as evidence for the importance of the careful transmission of the oral tradition: "Only take heed to thyself and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the words which thine eyes saw." The last phrase indicates that the Biblical μαρτυς may be regarded as a teacher of the traditional doctrine (Aboth. 3.9).

The largest number of verses concerns the testimony borne by the Holy Spirit through the scriptures to certain aspects of the gospel. In 2.6 διεμαρτύρατο δὲ πού τις λέγων introduces a quotation from Ps.8.5-7 and according to the Alexandrian theory of inspiration the Psalmist's words have God's authority.⁽⁴⁾ The content of the testimony in this case shows that there is here no question of eye-or-ear-witness testimony for it is testimony to the lordship of Christ which is something which has to be believed, what is actually seen is the suffering of the man Jesus through which he and his brethren are believed to be made perfect or which is seen simply as suffering.

(1) Παλαιῶν would appear to go back to Prov.3.21, cf. Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 17.

(2) Cf. Is.8.18.

(3) Cf. God's approving (ἀποδείκνυται) of Jesus by miracles, wonders and signs (Ac.2.22).

(4) Cf. Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 22: "His words are God's words (v.8)".

Μαρτυρούμενος (7.8) like μαρτυρεῖται (11.5) is a simple case of the Middle of μαρτυρεῖν used as a passive to denote the teaching of a part of scripture about someone.⁽¹⁾ There is no particular reason why God should be taken as the subject and the verb as being in the active sense in these verses but the necessity will be seen to arise later in the case of 11.2,39.

The Holy Spirit is the subject of μαρτυρεῖ in 10.15, teaching the Church the message of salvation through Jeremiah, and Enoch is given the testimony that he pleased God (11.5). The last two instances of this group are in 11.4 where Abel is attested (ἐμαρτυρήθη) - again, a simple passive - to be righteous because of his better sacrifices; this is put into active form in the following phrase: μαρτυροῦντος τοῦ Θεοῦ.⁽²⁾ Moffatt⁽³⁾ is right when he says: "Ἔτι λαλεῖ means in a general sense that he (Abel) is an eloquent, living witness to all ages"; he is, after all, one of the cloud of witnesses of 12.1, who may be discussed at this juncture.

Two points are to be made about the cloud of witnesses: (1) The phrase⁽⁴⁾ obviously refers to the men who have been mentioned in the preceding chapter;⁽⁵⁾ this is made abundantly clear by the strong τοιγαροῦν which links the two chapters.

(1) The AV translates μαρτυρεῖται as "he testifieth"; Luther has "Denn es wird bezeugt" and NEB, avoiding the issue, gives "Here is the testimony".

(2) It is probable that this goes back to Gen. 4.4: καὶ ἐπέειδεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἀβελ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ.

(3) Hebrews, p. 164 (following Seeberg).

(4) Cf. Ps. 98.6f. where it is said that God spoke to Moses, Aaron and Samuel in a pillar of cloud and ἐφύλασσαν τὰ μαρτυρία αὐτοῦ.

(5) Cf. Gass. ZHT, (1859), III. pp. 326f. and Spicq. L'Épître aux Hébreux, p. 384: "les μαρτυρεῖς sont évidemment les héros de l'ancienne alliance."

(2) If these men are witnesses they cannot be regarded as such on the grounds that testimony has been borne to them.⁽¹⁾ A witness is someone who bears witness to someone or something⁽²⁾ but there is a widespread tendency to accept without embarrassment the sudden change from the thought of the heroes of faith as men who receive testimony ($\mu\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$) to that of men who give testimony ($\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$).⁽³⁾ It is however,

(1) Asting's explanation (*Die Verkündigung*, p. 645) is artificial: "Der Bericht der Schrift über diese Glaubenshelden das 'Zeugnis' ist. Also, diese Persönlichkeiten, so wie sie in der Schrift geschildert werden, sind $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$, d.h. dass sie in den Berichten über sie - das Wesen und die Wirkungen des Glaubens klarmachen." Michel (*Der Brief an der Hebräer*, p. 79, note 3) takes the view that $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ means 'being given the testimony by God': "Gott bekennt sich durch die Schrift zu dem Menschen, und die Schrift ist das Zeugnis für die Geschichte, die Geschichte, die Gott mit dem Menschengeschlecht gegangen ist." (followed by Spicq. *Hébreux*, p. 327 and Käsemann: *Das wandernde Gottesvolk*, pp. 37-39. The $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ become $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ when they in turn pass on the message they have been given. This explanation does away with the need to take $\epsilon\mu\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\upsilon\eta\theta\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu$ (11.2) and $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\upsilon\eta\theta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ (11.39) as having an active meaning and is an attractive alternative.

(2) Cf. Strathmann, *Theol. Literaturblatt*, 37 (1916), p. 338.

(3) Strathmann, admittedly, notices the 'Hinüberspringen' but adds nothing to remove the difficulty (*KWB*, IV, 495. 13-20). He sees the $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ here as witnesses of fact, i.e. of the race but this cannot be maintained in view of the above evidence, Käsemann (*Das wandernde Gottesvolk*, p. 39) notes the transition and gives as his reason: "Insofern freilich die erste Diatheeke nicht zur Erfüllung gelangte, sind sie nicht $\kappa\omicron\mu\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ der Verheissung geworden, sondern Wartende auf die Christus-Vollendung geblieben. Doch verbindet gerade dies sie wieder mit dem zweiten Gottesvolk, das ja auch noch nicht zum Ziele kam. Darum werden sie aus göttlichen $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\upsilon\eta\theta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ zu $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ für die Christenheit und enthüllen dieser beispielhaft ihre irdische Heimatlosigkeit und weisen sie um so stärker auf die göttliche Verheissung." This, however, leaves out the fact that the OT describes the prophets and heroes as active witnesses (cf. 3.5) and also the non-fulfilment of the new covenant (cf. 2.8c.).

possible to find a smooth transition by taking the ἑμαρτυρήθησαν of 11.2 and the μαρτυρηθέντις of 11.39 as having an active meaning;⁽¹⁾ there are precedents for this in the LXX translation of Gen 43.3: Μεμαρτύρηται ἡμῖν ὁ ἄνθρωπος λέγων... (H B reading) and Ex.21.36: Μεμαρτυρημένοι ὡσιν τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ (B reading). Thus 11.2 may very well be translated: "For by this (faith) the elders gave their testimony" and 11.39: "And all these, having testified by faith, did not obtain the promise". In view of the fact, already demonstrated, that the μάτερος and κήρυξ word-groups are very closely allied, weight is given to the present argument by I Clem.17.1: "Let us also be imitators of those who went about 'in the skins of goats and sheep', heralding (κηρύσσοντες) the coming of Christ."⁽²⁾

There is a close similarity between this section of Hebrews and IV Macc.⁽³⁾ and Eleazar, the mother and her seven sons are obviously to be classed among the μάτερες who surround the author and his readers. Their actions are called testimony (μαρτυρία) (IV Macc. 12.16 (A reading); cf. 16.16). These heroes of God testified to the kingship of God, his moral law, his redeeming action and his promise of condemnation or eternal life.⁽⁴⁾ The mother said to her sons: Γενναῖος ὁ ἀγών, ἐφ' ᾧ

(1) Against Moffatt (Hebrews) who takes μαρτυρεῖσθαι, throughout as meaning 'to obtain a good report'.

(2) Cf. Ign. ad Phil. 11.1: Πρεῖ δὲ Φίλωνος τοῦ διακόνου ἀπὸ Κιλικίας, ἀνδρὸς μεμαρτυρημένου ὅς καὶ νῦν ἐν λόγῳ τοῦ ὑπηρετεῖ μοι ἅμα ῥέω... αἱ καὶ μαρτυροῦσιν ἡμῖν

(3) Michel, Der Brief an der Hebräer, p. 288, note 6.

(4) It is significant that four out of the seven brothers and the mother testify to the resurrection in IV Macc.

κληθέντες ὑπὲρ τῆς διαμαρτυρίας τοῦ ἔθνους
 ἐναγωνίασθε προθύμως ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρῷου νόμου .
 If IV Macc. is any guide the μάετες of Heb.12.1 does not
 mean 'spectators' ⁽¹⁾ for in the Jewish book they are not
 passive onlookers but active contestants and it is the world
 and mankind who are the spectators. ⁽²⁾ The parallel passage
 in Is. 43 is hinted at in the reference to the father of the
 seven who when he was alive used to teach them the law and
 the prophets and used to remind them (ὑπερίμνησκειν) of
 Is.43.1f. (IV Macc. 18.9-14) (and no doubt also of Is.43.10,
 12). The Christians to whom the author of Hebrews is writ-
 ing are contestants in the same struggle and must run this
 race with that same ὑπομόνη which overcame the tyrant (IV
 Macc. 1.11), only they are to look, not to a shadowy hope but
 to Jesus who is the ἀρχηγός and τελειωτής ⁽³⁾ of the faith.
 There are thus grounds for the assumption that since for the
 author of IV Macc. the μάετος is the man who by word and
 action 'sees' the invisible (Heb.11.1,3,7f.,11,13,26f.) and
 upholds and teaches the torah or testimony (also called
 εὐσέβεια, γνῶσις, σοφία, δόγμα and παιδεία)
 so for the author of Hebrews the μάετες are not only
 Jesus and those who heard him and God Himself along with

(1) Cf. Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews. "There is
 apparently no evidence that μάετος is ever used simply in the
 sense of a 'spectator'", but then he goes on to say: "These
 champions of old time.....are spectators who interpret to us
 the meaning of our struggle and who bear testimony to the
 certainty of our success if we strive lawfully (2 Tim2.5)",
 (p.391). This view is wide of the mark.

(2) IV Macc.17.13f: Ἐλεάσαρ δὲ προηγωνίζετο, ἡ δὲ μήτηρ τῶν
 ἑπτὰ παίδων ἐνήθλει, οἱ δὲ ἀδελφοὶ ἠγωνίζοντο. ὁ
 τύραννος ἀντηγωνίζετο· ὁ δὲ κόσμος καὶ ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος
 ἐξέσῳρει.

(3) Τελείωσις is the LXX rendering of תַּלְמִיד = teacher in I
 Chron.25.8.

the Holy Spirit (2.3f.) but also all who have received this testimony and adhere to it (3.12f.) and confess it (4.14; 10.23) and teach it (5.12, 6.10); those who having 'seen' the invisible⁽¹⁾ continue to keep their eyes on it, looking to Jesus...who is set at the right hand of the throne of God (12.2, 14; cf. Mt. 5.8). This view is supported by the reference to the cloud of witnesses which is an echo of a passage in Proverbs (16.13-17) where those who are in favour with the son of a king are said to be ὥσπερ νέφος ὀψιμὸν (v.15). Casey⁽²⁾ states: "The cloud of witnesses....are not missionaries but heroes" to which it must be replied that while they are admittedly heroes they are also undoubtedly missionaries in the true sense that they have a commission from God to proclaim his word in faithfulness and truth, that is, to be true and faithful witnesses.

The nature of the testimony of which the author of Hebrews writes is the fulfilment of the torah of God (10.1; 11.40),⁽³⁾ the gospel of Christ which is the τελείωσις of the torah (cf. 7.12), the law of the new covenant, written in the heart (10.15f.). It is called variously: salvation (2.3);⁽⁴⁾ the gospel (4.2); the word of God (4.12, 13.7),

(1) Cf. Corssen, *NJKA*. 37(1916), p. 426.

(2) *Beginnings of Christianity* V. p. 36.

(3) Strathmann (KWB.IV, 510.22-26) confines the μαρτύριον to the legal enactments given through Moses but it is clear that Christ is also εἰς μαρτύριον (cf. I Tim. 2.6).

(4) See Ps. 118.123-130.

the λόγια of God (5.12), the word of righteousness (5.13), the word of Christ (6.1), the heavenly gift (6.4), laws given by God (8.10), the knowledge of the truth (10.26). In this letter the testimony is seen to be the teaching about God contained in the OT and fulfilled in Christ.

The Content of the Testimony

The content of the testimony is fourfold: (a) The kingship of Jesus by whom God created the worlds is declared in 2.9: He is crowned with glory and honour (cf. 1.2f., 8 and 7.2, 26; 8.1). (b) Reference to the moral law is found in 3.10, 12, 17; 6.1. (c) The redemptive work of Jesus is salvation (2.3, 9); the power of evil is destroyed by the death of Jesus (2.14); Jesus is the author of eternal salvation, being able to save to the uttermost (7.25, 27); he has obtained eternal redemption (9.12) and put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. (d) The promise of future glory appears in the claim that all things are put under Jesus although this is not at present obvious (2.8); eternal judgement is given as part of the essential doctrine of the church (6.2); the promise of an eternal inheritance is made to those who are called (9.15) and to those who look for him he shall appear the second time (9.28).

These four aspects are seen in close association in chapters 11 and 12: (a) The testimony of the elders is that the worlds were framed by the word of God (11.3); (b) they emphasise the demand for righteousness (11.4); (c) the idea of sacrifice for sin and salvation occurs in 11.4, 7; (d) and the promises occur in 11.8, 13, 16, 26. The testament of the new covenant speaks (a) of Jesus being set down at the right hand of God's throne (12.2); (b) the requirement of the peaceable fruit of righteousness enters in 12.11, 13-16; (c) Jesus'

suffering on the cross is mentioned in 12.2f. that he might sanctify the people with his own blood (13.12); (d) judgement is foretold to those who refuse this salvation (12.25f.) and the blessing of the faithful is referred to in 12.17 (cf. 13.14).

The Authority of the Witnesses

When the authority of the witnesses is considered it is seen to be a teaching authority which claims very little for itself but much for the message taught, for this is regarded as the revelation of God. Simply put, the witnesses of the old dispensation are the Holy Spirit of God, Moses, the prophets who spoke God's word and the prophets and heroes who maintained it. The witnesses of the new era are Jesus, the Son of God who embodies the testimony, those who heard him and God himself who corroborates the testimony with signs and wonders and miracles and gifts of the Spirit. The prophetic authority has already been shown to depend on the testimony and on faith in it and the authority of those who heard Jesus and spoke their testimony is akin to that of the prophets of old. Their testimony⁽¹⁾ is a message which has been spoken by God and heard by them. There appears to be no exclusive control of the community by an official ruling class for the writer tells them to exhort, that is, teach one another (3.13), for there is a danger that some may rebel (παρεπείκελαν) (3.16).⁽²⁾

(1) The σύν of συνεπιμαρτυροῦντες shows that the author regards the Lord and those who heard him as witnesses.

(2) Cf. e.g. Ex.15.23-26 where the statutes and judgements of God, the instruction of Moses, are the antidote to bitterness or rebellion. For wisdom as a tree of life see Prov.3.18. See also Dt.31.27, Ps.105.7 and esp. Ezek.2.5-8 with its reference to the rebellious house of Israel (cf. Heb.3.8f.); Ac.8.23, Ro. 3.14, Heb.12.15.

The remark that the Hebrews ought by this time to be themselves teachers of the message but that they have not made much advance beyond the first principles (5.12ff.)⁽¹⁾ shows that the leaders are the teachers of the church.⁽²⁾ Those who have the rule (ἡγούμενοι⁽³⁾) over the Hebrews are those who have spoken the word of God and they are to be obeyed because they are the watchmen (ἀγρυπνοῦσιν⁽⁴⁾) (13.7,17,24) of the souls of the church members as those who will render an account of their work. No hard and fast distinction, however, is made between the ἡγούμενοι and the generality of the members who are to look diligently (ἐπισκοπεῖν) in case any of their fellows fall from the grace of God through false teaching (12.15); this idea is repeated in the injunction to exhort one another (3.12f.). Even the writer uses no strong word of command but simply exhorts them to receive the word of exhortation (13.22). As far as can be seen the writer of the letter has no recourse to a special

(1) Cf. Is.28.9.

(2) Harnack (The Expositor. Ser.3.V, p. 330, note 3): "Only the teachers of the Divine word are so named (ἡγούμενοι) in Hebrews and no other persons are singled out for honour."

(3) Paul is described in Ac.14.12 as ὁ ἡγούμενος τοῦ λόγου. It is possible to read from Ac.15.22f. that the ἡγούμενοι and the elders are one and the same, being distinguished on the one hand from apostles and on the other from the brethren.

Robinson (The Christian Ministry) disputes "the theory that at any period there existed a 'triad' of Apostles, prophets and teachers with a personal pre-eminence and a recognised claim to honour. Such a pre-eminence remains undisputed for the Apostles." (p.78). R. also denies that Heb.13.9 could ever by itself have suggested that the term 'those who speak the word of God' was a recognised description of leaders of the church (p.72) but this is to fly in the face of the plain meaning of ἡγούμενοι.

(4) Ἀγρυπνεῖν = watch, in the sense of guard; cf. I Esd.8.58; II Esd. 8.29; Ps.126.1 and esp. Sir.33.16-19: καὶ ἡ ἐσχατοὺς ἡγρυπνήσα as one who gleans after the grape-gatherers; by the grace of the Lord I overtook them and filled my wine-press like a gatherer of grapes κατανοήσατε ὅτι οὐκ ἔμοι μόνῃ ἐκοπίασα, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν τοῖς ζητοῦσιν παιδείαν. ἀκούσατέ μου μέγιστ' ἀνδρες λαοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἡγούμενοι ἐκκλησίας, ἐνωτίσασθε. Watching is the function of the prophet

succession for authority, unless it is the succession of GodMoses....the OT prophets....Jesus....those who heard himthe author and his readers (by virtue of the prominence of ἡμεῖς and ἡμᾶς (in 2.3). The source of the authority is the Lord himself. Those who heard him simply testified to (βεβαιῶν) (2.3) what he had said; their authority is the 'salvation' which he spoke and as they were devoted to it so also should be those to whom they in turn testified (2.1). The testimony was delivered to the Christians as well as to the people of the old covenant but the former believed it while the latter rejected it (4.2,6); it remains that those who believed should continue to do so by holding fast their profession.

The Authority of the Testimony

The Hebrews, the writer claims, should by now be qualified as teachers or witnesses of the things which they have heard but in fact they need to be taught again τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ (5.12)⁽¹⁾ The ἀρχή is the call to repentance and faith; the τελειότης, on the other hand, is βαπτισμῶν διδασχῆ, ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν, ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου (6.2), taking μὴ πάλιν ἐπὶ Θεόν as a parenthesis and accepting the reading διδασχῆν of p⁴⁶D. From this it may be inferred that the teaching or testimony had broad outlines even if it was not set out in detail and it has its source in

(σκοπὸς in Ezek.3.17; 33.2,7). In Is.56.10f. (Heb.) the watchmen are shepherds and in 62.6 they are the people who make mention of the Lord (μνησκόμενοι).

(1) Cf. Mk.1.1: Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and Heb. 6.1: ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον.

Jesus, or, as is sometimes said, in God (5.12; 6.1; cf. I Cor.1.6, 2.1); it is his teaching, given by him to those who were with him and heard him, and passed faithfully to others. This teaching is described in 6.4 as an enlightening (φωτισθέντας), ⁽¹⁾ as a heavenly gift; ⁽²⁾ those to whom the Holy Spirit has testified in scripture and through the hearers of Jesus, those who have been taught the testimony have been made partakers of the Holy Spirit (6.4). The witnesses, i.e. those who pass on the testimony, may be described as charismatics, not in the sense of being ecstasies but as having received the teaching of the Spirit of truth, the knowledge of the truth (10.26). Anyone who acts contrary to the testimony of the new covenant does despite to the spirit of grace (10.29).

The Transmission of the Testimony

Finally, the Epistle to the Hebrews shows, like all the other NT documents, the intense concern of the first Christians that the grace-gift of the testimony should be held firmly and passed on unchanged. In 2.1 the author stresses the obligation to pay close attention (περισσοτέρως προσέχειν) ⁽³⁾ to the things heard.

Moses, as a servant, was faithful; Jesus, as a son, was faithful and the readers must hold fast the confidence and the

(1) Cf. II Esd.17.65; Ps.18.8f. where the commandment (=μαρτύρια) is said to enlighten the eyes; Ps.118.129f: ἡ δὴλωση τῶν λόγων σου φωτίζει καὶ συνετίει νηπίους. Sir.45.17 where Aaron is said to have been given authority to teach Jacob the testimonies καὶ ἐν νόμῳ αὐτοῦ φωτίσαι Ἰσραὴλ. Cf. Sir.24.27,32; Hos.10.12.
 (2) Cf. 8.10; Prov.4.1-3.
 (3) Cf. Ps.77.1-5: προσέχετε τὸν νόμον μου (=μαρτύριον v.5) which is to be made known by the fathers to the sons; cf. Jer.6.19.

rejoicing of the hope firm to the end (3.6,14; 10.35). As a warning the writer recalls the fate of those who at the time of the Exodus erred in their hearts and did not know God's ways (i.e. his torah).⁽¹⁾ The Hebrews are to hold fast their profession of faith without wavering ($\alpha\kappa\lambda\iota\nu\eta$) (10.23; cf. IV Macc. 6.7; 17.3), not hardening their hearts in unbelief. Those who hear and believe should become proficient in the teaching, having the law written in their minds (8.10; 10.16) and in turn teach others (5.12ff.). There is to be oversight in the Church ($\varepsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$) (12.15) in case any should fall short of the grace of God and lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble them and many be defiled.⁽²⁾ They are to follow the faith of the leaders who spoke the word of God to them and are not to be carried about with different and strange doctrines (13.7-9) which substitute the yoke of ritual and ceremonial laws for the freedom of the gospel.

The Hebrew Christians are instructed to remember their leaders but this is not necessarily a reference to martyrs (with Moffatt⁽³⁾ who takes $\varepsilon\kappa\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (13.7) to be a metaphor for death as in Sap.2.17. Against this is to be set the fact that $\varepsilon\kappa\beta\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ is used of Israel (in Abraham the father of faith) having left the way of their ancestors in Chaldaea to worship the God of heaven (Judith 5.8)). The Hebrews are to

(1) See above p. 420, note 2 .

(2) Cf. Dt. 29.17.

(3) Hebrews pp. 230f.

follow their leaders' faith, that is, their teaching.⁽¹⁾

Conclusion

The subject of the testifying mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews is the greater salvation, the new torah announced by and fulfilled in Jesus and testified beforehand by the Holy Spirit through Moses and the prophets and heroes of the old dispensation. The authorities in the churches addressed are the teachers but there is no hard and fast distinction made between leaders and led. Authority in the Church depends on adherence to, expertness in and obedience to the testimony. The testimony is a spiritual gift which must be faithfully preserved and handed on; such faithfulness was the mark of the heroes of old, of Jesus, the captain of salvation and, indeed, of the people addressed, during a recent persecution. The message of the gospel is of paramount importance and so must be preserved intact for the salvation of men and the glory of God.

(1) Cf. Michel (KWB. IV, 686. 38f.): "Auch sonst gilt der Grundsatz, dass man derer gedenken soll, von denen man das Wort empfangen hat."

CHAPTER XVITESTIMONY IN THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN.The Nature of the Testimony

The Revelation contains one instance of μαρτύριον in the phrase 'tent of witness' (15.5). Other members of the word-group used are μάρτυς, μαρτυρεῖν and μαρτυρία. The first witness⁽¹⁾ to be mentioned is the author of the book, God's servant, John ὃς ἐμαρτύρησεν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and who was in the isle of Patmos διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ (1.2,9). He is implicitly said to be a prophet in 1.3; 22.7, 9f., 18f. and in 22.16 he is called the messenger of Jesus sent to testify (μαρτυρεῖν) in the churches and in view of the way in which this verb is used throughout the book it is probably used absolutely in 22.18, 20, the subject being the author and the object being the testimony of his book. This prophet has fellow-prophets, God's servants (10.7), who have the μαρτυρία of Jesus (19.10).

Jesus Christ is called ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός (1.5),⁽²⁾ that

(1) Cf. Kattenbusch (ZNW. 4 (1903), p. 114, note 1): "die μάρτυρες Ἰησοῦ sind diejenigen, die Offenbarungen von ihm empfangen und weiter geben." Von Campenhausen's words (*Idee*, p. 44) are literally true: "In Apoc. es (μάρτυς) wird tatsächlich nur für die Zeugen gebraucht, die für ihr Zeugnis auch gestorben sind, also die Blutzeugen, die Märtyrer" but if a μάρτυς is one who renders μαρτυρία or μαρτύριον then the author is one - and is not dead at the time of writing!

(2) Strathmann's comment (KWB. IV. 507.36-41): "Im Ausdruck μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ klingt eine Erinnerung an Jesu Passion mit. vgl. I Tim. 6.12." is correct but to follow on with: "Der Begriff beginnt sich martyrologisch zu verfärben" does not describe a necessary consequence. The whole aim of the Book of Revelation, (and this is very obvious in the Seven Letters) is to encourage the Christians to hold fast the true doctrine faithfully. (cf. Philo. *De Sacr. Abelis*. I. 167. Loeb Ed. Vol. II. p. 120 where Moses is called πιστός μάρτυς.) This may cause suffering

is, the perfect or complete witness;⁽¹⁾ he is also called 'ο
 Ἀμην, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ὁ ἀληθινός (3.14).⁽²⁾
 This means that Jesus as μάρτυς is the teacher who gives the
 authentic revelation of God⁽³⁾ rather than "Urbild und Vorbild
 der Märtyrer".⁽⁴⁾

and even death but they are not commissioned to die! This is true of all the prophets; Moses was in mortal danger more than once (Ex.17.4; Num.14.10) and the other prophets were in the same case. Günther (Μάρτυς, pp. 129f.) with his emphasis on Apocalyptic gives too narrow a picture when he says of Rev.1.5 "Hier haben wir den Höhepunkt des apokalyptischen Zeugenbegriffs. Alle für diesen 'Zeugen' konstitutiven Momente erscheinen in ihm in der Vollendung. Er ist der, der Himmel und Erde im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes in sich verbindet. Als der 'Erhöhte' empfängt er die Offenbarung direkt von Gott und gibt sie dann weiter..... daher wird sie μαρτυρία 'i. X.' genannt 1.1". The apocalyptists were no more open to persecution than Moses and the OT prophets; the author is clearly dependent here on the Messianic Psalm. 88.19-37.

(1) Charles (The Revelation of St. John I, p. 14) sees behind this the thought in the above-mentioned Messianic Psalm but takes the moon as the subject in v.38. Against this must be set the fact that when ἡ is used of inanimate objects it is always translated as μαρτυρίαν in the LXX.

(2) Surkau (Martyrien, p. 82) quotes Rev.3.14 at the beginning of his chapter on Mark's story of the Passion of Jesus on the unjustified assumption that μάρτυς here means martyr; cf. ib. p. 142 with note 33.

(3) Cf. Mt.22.16; Jn.3.2.

(4) Cf. Sir.48.22-25: ἐποίησεν γὰρ Εἰσεκίας τὸ ἀρεστὸν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐνίσχυσεν ἐν ὁδοῖς Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἐντείλατο Ἡσαίας ὁ προφήτης ὁ μέγας καὶ πιστὸς ἐν ὁράσει αὐτοῦ. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἀνέποδισεν ὁ ἥλιος καὶ προσέθηκεν ζωὴν βασιλεῖ. πνεύματι μεγάλῳ εἶδεν τὰ ἐσχάτα καὶ παρεκάλεσεν τοὺς πενθοῦντας ἐν Σιών. ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ὑπέδειξεν τὰ ἐσόμενα καὶ τὰ ἀπόκρυφα πρὶν ἢ παραγινέσθαι αὐτά ; and von Campenhausen: Idee, p. 44. Lohmeyer (Die Offenbarung, p. 10) states that Jesus is a μάρτυς because he has sealed his testimony in his earthly existence with death but this is not borne out by the use of the word-group in the rest of the Bible.

Antipas the faithful *μάρτυς*, i.e. witness not martyr, (2.13)⁽¹⁾ of the Lord in Pergamos was apparently a prominent person in the church⁽²⁾ since he is the only named victim of the persecution. Practically the whole of this letter to Pergamos, like the other letters, concerns the holding or denying of the true faith. To hold Jesus' name (2.13) is opposed to holding the teaching of Balaam and the Nicolaitans. Antipas' testimony is that of Jesus who is the swift witness (2.16).⁽³⁾

Various interpretations have been offered of the two prophetic *μάρτυρες* in chap 11 e.g. Moses and Elijah, Elijah and Elisha, Enoch and Elijah, the Law and the Prophets, the OT and the NT and, in the latest view - that of Munck,⁽⁴⁾ Peter and Paul. Swete⁽⁵⁾ is correct in seeing them as representing the Church in her function as witness-bearer⁽⁶⁾ but his reference to Dt.19.15 and his explanation of the sackcloth

(1) As Gass (*ZHT*.3(1859), p. 327) who decided that *μάρτυς* in Rev.2.13; 17.6 means 'martyr' "weil das ganze Buch den Beginn der Verfolgungen voraussetzt." (followed by Holl, Charles, Corssen, Schlatter, Lohmeyer, von Campenhausen and others); it would have been better to look to the origin of the word in the OT than to its later development. Laberthonnière (*Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne*. 3(1906/07) saw correctly that "les martyres sont témoins, non d'un fait sensible, considéré comme tel, mais d'une doctrine." Swete (*The Apocalypse of St. John*, p. 35) resists the temptation to translate *μάρτυς* by 'martyr' in 2.13. Kattenbusch (*ZNW* 4(1903), p. 114.2) regards it as tolerably certain that Antipas was a prophet; cf. Strathmann, *KWB*. IV, 499.26-30; Casey, *Beginnings of Christianity*, V. pp. 35f. Günther (*Μάρτυς*, p. 112) adduces *πίστος* as proof that the meaning here is not 'martyr' for it means 'dependable'.

(2) M. Barth (*Der Augenzeuge*, p. 275) denies that Antipas was a witness in the same way as the Apostles with an unsatisfactory argument from silence.

(3) See above p. 62 on Mal.3.5ff.

(4) *Petrus und Paulus in der Offenbarung Johannis* (1950); see ib. pp. 7-13 for other interpretations. Cerfaux (*Recueil* II. pp. 164, 171f) opts for the OT and NT prophets.

(5) *The Apocalypse of St. John* p. 131f.

(6) Cf. Strathmann, *KWB*, IV, 499.22-26.

as being prophetic clothing while being true as far as it goes does not go far enough; he is nearer the mark however in noting the implication of penitence. When Rev. 10 and 11 are read in the light of Is. 43 and 44 and the early chapters of Jeremiah it is hard to reject the conclusion that the two witnesses, that is, the two olive trees⁽¹⁾ and the two candlesticks are Israel and Judah, ideally God's witnesses (not martyrs)⁽²⁾ who are really one people represented by God's servants the prophets⁽³⁾ and now replaced by the Church as lightbearer. This identification emerges from a comparison of Rev. 10.7 - 11.4 and Jer. 4.18 - 11.17.

Revelation

And the voice spake unto me again, and said, Go. (10.8)
...prophecy again. (10.11).

And I took the little book out of the angel's hand and ate it up; and it was in my mouth sweet as honey: and as soon as I had eaten it, my belly was bitter. (10.10).

Jeremiah (LXX)

Proclaim in Jerusalem. (4.16).

This is thy wickedness because it is bitter, for it has reached to thy heart. I have pain in my belly, my belly...for my soul has heard the voice of a trumpet. (4.18f.).

(1)?? in Ezek. 37.16f. = 'tree' - "One of the common metaphors of the Hebrew Scriptures is that of a 'tree' to represent a people." (W.E. Barnes, Two Trees become One. Ezekiel XXXVII. 16-17 in JTS. XXXIX(1938), pp. 391-393.

(2) Lohmeyer (Die Offenbarung, p. 8) is correct when he says: "Auch sie (μαρτυροῦντες und μαρτυρεῖν) lehnen sich an attische Formulierungen an, μαρτυρεῖν und μαρτυρεῖν noch den allgemeinen, aber heroisch erfüllten Sinn des 'Zeugens' behalten," but cuts off the etymological roots of the word-group by continuing: "vor allem an den Schöpfer des Märtyrergedankens in Judentum, Deutero-Jesaja (43.9; 12; 44.18)." and "μαρτυρῶν ist also der 'Blutzeuge', der 'Märtyrer' (s.zu 1.5; 2.13; 3.14; 11.3; 17.6)."

(3) Cf. Holl (Ges. Aufs. II, pp. 104f.): μαρτυρῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ "der spätjüdische Titel für den Propheten gewesen ist". Corssen's argument in NJKA. 37(1916), p. 425.2 that the voice is that of the angel does not do justice to the fact that the angel speaks God's message in God's words.

Revelation

But the court which is without the temple leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles; and the holy city shall they tread under foot. (11.2).

My two witnesses...shall prophesy....., clothed in sackcloth. (11.3).

These are the two olive trees. (11.4).

Jeremiah (LXX)

For all the land is distressed: suddenly my tabernacle is distressed, my curtains have been rent asunder. (4.20).

For these things gird yourselves with sackcloths, and lament. (4.8; cf. 6.26).

And the house of Israel and the house of Judah have broken my covenant which I made with their fathers. (11.10). The Lord called thy name a fair olive tree.....her branches are become good for nothing. (11.16).⁽¹⁾

That the two witnesses denote the Church of God is confirmed by the reference to the two candlesticks, Jesus himself having told his disciples to be lightbearers (Mt.5.15f.; par). The destruction of Jerusalem which is the subject of this part of the Revelation is described in 11.7ff. and there are fore-shadowings of this in Jer.6.19; 7.33; 14.16. The author, however, agrees with Paul (Ro.11.26) that all Israel will be revived and raised to heaven (11.11f.) - an idea expressed in Jer.8.1-4; this is to be followed by an earthquake (Rev.11.13; cf. Jer. 8.16; 10.10) when dead bodies will lie in the street of the city where our Lord was crucified (Rev.11.8f.; cf. Jer. 4.31; 5.1; cf. Jer.7.33; 8.1f.). From all this it may be

(1) In Ro. 11.17-24 Paul likens the Jews to an olive whose root remains but onto which are grafted branches of a wild olive (the Gentiles).

deduced that the two witnesses are the people of God seen as prophetic representatives and as a whole. They are those who have received, teach and hold the testimony of God, priests and kings of God.⁽¹⁾

After the opening of the fifth seal John sees under the heavenly altar τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφαγμένων διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἣν εἶχον (6.9);⁽²⁾ these are said to have fellow-servants and brethren (v.11), which suggests that those who had the testimony are prophets (10.7; cf. 19.10; 22.9).⁽³⁾ In 12.11 the brethren are said to have overcome the accuser by the blood of the Lamb and the word of their testimony (διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν), that is, the testimony of the cross,⁽⁴⁾ not "because of their testifying to Jesus"⁽⁵⁾ since it is the faith which conquers (I Jn.5.4) and Christ who has overcome the world (Jn.16.33) and he who overcomes is he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God (I Jn. 5.5). In 12.17 they are called "the remnant of the seed of the woman clothed with the sun, who keep or guard the commands of God and the testimony (μαρτυρίαν) of Jesus Christ. In 17.6 the woman seated

(1) Cf. G.A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, II, pp. 297ff., Ex. 19.6; Rev. 5.10. It makes little difference whether the witnesses are Christ's (Corssen) or God's (Holl) for the testimony of Christ and that of God are the same. Christ teaches the testimony of God and so do his prophets. Günther adds nothing by his emphasis on apocalyptic (Μάρτυς, p. 127) where the witness is the bearer of a heavenly message; this may be said of all the prophets of the OT.

(2) Michel (Ev. Theol. 2(1935), p. 242, note 14) asks the pertinent question. "liegt in dieser Wendung ein Hinweis auf das βοηθῆσεται und das πνεῦμα ἅγιον von Matth. 10.19-20?" but he would interpret the phrase as showing that those who have the testimony have proved themselves true disciples rather than that they are teachers of the μαρτύριον.

(3) Lohmeyer, Die Offenbarung, p. 157.

(4) Cf. I Cor. 2.1f.

(5) With Swete. The Apocalypse, p. 153.

on the scarlet beast is said to be drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the witnesses⁽¹⁾ of Jesus⁽²⁾ (μαρτύρων Ἰησοῦ). In 20.4, in the vision of the angel who introduces the Millennium, John has a vision of the souls who were beheaded διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ and these are living and reigning with Christ.

There are grounds for believing that all these witnesses are the NT counterpart of the Levites (οἱ ἅγιοι)⁽³⁾ of the old dispensation: καὶ φυλάξουσιν οἱ Λευῖται αὐτοὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου (Num. 1.53b). The passage about the Levites' consecration in Num. 8.5-26 provides illuminating evidence: καὶ πλυνούσιν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν καὶ καθαροὶ ἔσονται (v.7);⁽⁴⁾ καὶ προσάξεις τοὺς Λευίτας ἔναντι τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου (v.9); καὶ ἐπιθήσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς Λευίτας (v.10) καὶ ἀφοριεῖ Ἀαρὼν τοὺς Λευίτας ἀπόδομα ἔναντι κυρίου παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔσονται ὥστε ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα κυρίου (v.11) καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσελεύσονται οἱ Λευῖται ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου

(1) Not martyrs with Strathmann, *KWB*. IV, 499.30-34. Kattenbusch (*ZNW*. 4(1903), p. 114, note 1) points out that μαρτυρες are distinguished from ἅγιοι yet both are martyrs. Schweizer (*Church Order*, note 491) assumes that μαρτυρες means 'martyrs'.

(2) The second ἐκ shows that saints and witnesses are distinct; cf. Swete on 22.6 (*The Apocalypse*, p. 200), cf. 16.6; 18.20.

(3) Strathmann (*KWB*. IV, 507) makes it clear that they are the proclaimers of the testimony, although he separates them from the slaughtered saints beside whom they stand and says that the name is reserved for those who are active evangelically.

(4) Cf. Rev. 7.14; 22.14 reading with NA: οἱ πλύνοντες τὰς στολάς αὐτῶν .

καὶ καθαριεῖς αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀποδώσεις αὐτοὺς ἔναντι κυρίου .
 (v.15); καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐσηλθον οἱ Λευῖται λειτουργεῖν
 τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου
 (v.22) εἰσελεύσονται ἐνεργεῖν ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ
 μαρτυρίου (v.24). The first Levites offered animal
 sacrifices and taught the torah of the Old Covenant; the
 'Levites' of the New Covenant are those whose own lives are
 under the alter (6.9), that is, whose persons have been
 devoted,⁽¹⁾ and who hold the testimony of Jesus, the new torah
 which he taught and which he is. They are blessed, according
 to 22.14, for they have authority over the tree of life (ἔσται
 ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς). This authority
 can be construed as a teaching one for in Prov. 3.18 σοφία
 or φρόνησις⁽²⁾ is ξύλον ζωῆς πᾶσι τοῖς ἀντεχομένοις
 αὐτῆς .⁽³⁾ Testimony may also be identified with
 prophecy in 1.2f; 6.9,11; 11.6f; 19.10.⁽³⁾ Whether the Ἰησοῦ
 and Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in these last-mentioned verses are
 subjective or objective genitive will never be absolutely
 certain but since, in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus describes his
 teaching as μαρτυρία it may be assumed that his early
 followers thought of their testimony as being that which he

(1) "The Church followed in the steps of 'the Lamb that was slain'.....The altar here in view is the counterpart of the Altar of burnt offering.....Their souls are seen "under the altar," because in the Levitical rite the blood which is the ψύχη (Lev.xvii.11.....)was poured out at the foot of the altar." (Swete, The Apocalypse, p. 88).

(2) Swete goes far astray here, basing 22.2, and presumably this passage also, on Ezek. 47.7 (The Apocalypse, p. 295) but see Prov. 3.11; cf. 10.17: ὁδὸς δικαίας ζωῆς φυλάσσει παιδεία 11.30;15.4.

(3) Cf. Lk. 1.17 where it is foretold by the angel that John the Baptist will turn the disobedient to the wisdom of the just (ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων). Lohmeyer (Die Offenbarung, pp. 180f.) has surely reversed the true chronological order when he writes: "Der Kreis der Propheten, die der 'Märtyrer' also Lehrer und Rater der Gemeinden sind...."

taught. At the same time, since he is himself the word, the testimony can also be thought of as that which he is. The former, however, can be thought of as including the latter since Jesus' teaching concerned his own person. It is therefore better to take the words as subjective genitive, referring to the doctrine which Jesus taught.⁽¹⁾

The testimony mentioned in the other books of the Bible has many similes and associated terms and some of these are found in The Revelation. In 11.6f. μαρτυρία and προφητεία clearly mean the same thing⁽²⁾ and in 1.1-3 both are associated with ἀποκάλυψις. 6.9 links the testimony with the word of God and other terms are: the name and the faith of Jesus (2.13); the works of the Lord (2.5, 9, 26; 3.2), the testimony is opposed to the δισαχί of Baalam and of the Nicolaitans (2.14f.) and that of the prophetess Jezebel (2.20); those who do not 'have' the latter (cf. 6.9 etc.) are given no other burden (2.24) for those who 'have' the true testimony do not need to be taught

(1) Cf. Lightfoot (Notes on Epistles of St. Paul p. 15) on ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου; R.H. Preston and A.T. Hanson (The Revelation of St. John the Divine, p. 120): "Jesus and his revelation of God, which Paul calls 'the mind of Christ', is the content of the prophet's message as it is of what John has been told to write in his book;" also Swete (The Apocalypse, p. 245f.) who considers that the main thought here is of the Church testifying to Jesus. "Those who have the witness of Jesus", he says, "are those who carry on his witness in the world" and he explains the last sentence of v.10 as meaning "the possession of the prophetic spirit which makes a true prophet, shows itself in the life of witness to Jesus which perpetuates his witness to the Father and to Himself; the two are in practice identical."

(2) Cf. Sir. 36.14 and Strathmann, KWB. IV, 506. 33-39.

(I Jn. 2.27)). The similarity between 3.5 and Mt.10.32 and the references in 3.5 and 12.11 to 'overcoming' allow the conclusion that the testimony of Jesus and the confession of his name are the same thing. The testimony is Christ's word (3.8), the word of his patience (3.10).⁽¹⁾ The testimony of Jesus Christ is closely linked to the ἐντολαί of God (12.17; cf. 14.12).

When, in 15.3, John says that those who have gained the victory over the beast sing the song of Moses the servant of God and the song of the Lamb, this also must surely be a reference to the testimony of the Old and New Testament, for the Song of Moses is called a testimony, a torah and a covenant (Dt. 31 passim)⁽²⁾ and to the new song, foreshadowed in Ps.32.3⁽³⁾ etc. and in Is. 42.10 where the Gentiles are called on to sing a new song to celebrate their salvation by the Servant, Jacob-Israel. This new song has already been mentioned twice, in Rev. 5.9 and 14.3. The twenty-four

(1) The Lord, Κύριος, is described as 'the hope (ἐπαγγελία) of Israel' in Jer. 14.8; 17.13; Ps. 38.8; 61.6; 70.5; so this phrase may simply mean 'the word of my God'.

(2) Charles (The Revelation of St. John, p. 34) writes: "The expression τὴν ᾠδὴν Μωϋσέως.... καὶ τὴν ᾠδὴν τοῦ Ἀρνίου creates insuperable difficulties" but this is only because he (pp. 34-37) with Lohmeyer (Die Apocalypse, p. 131) sees no connection with Dt. chapters 31f. except in a brief reference to content; they fail to see the total connection between this second Song of Moses (Moses' testimony) and the Song of the Lamb, the true and faithful witness which is the fulfilment of the Mosaic testimony and the torah which is taught by Jesus' witnesses. Charles is reduced to dismissing τὴν ᾠδὴν Μωϋσέως as a marginal gloss! Swete (The Apocalypse) does mention Dt. 32, referring to it as 'a Sabbath hymn in the Jewish liturgy' but draws no appropriate conclusions.

(3) See above p. 43 and note 2.

elders who sing the new song have been identified variously⁽¹⁾ but the best suggestion is that they, as well as the two prophetic witnesses of chapter 11 correspond to the twenty-four courses of Levites in I Chron. 23 and 24, ποιοῦντες τὰ ἔργα λειτουργίας οἴκου κυρίου (23.24).....καὶ φυλάξουσιν τὰς φυλακὰς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου (23.32; cf. Num. 3.7).⁽²⁾ And David divided them κατὰ τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν (I Chron. 24.3; cf. Ac. 1.20), he divided them κατὰ κλήρους...⁽³⁾ ὅτι ἦσαν ἄρχοντες τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἄρχοντες κυρίου (24.5).⁽³⁾ Swete objects that the elders do not fulfil any special priesthood and prefers the interpretation of Victorinus who sees in the twenty-four elders 'duodecim Apostoli, duodecim Patriarchae, twenty-four elders, two for each tribe' - "thus the 24 elders are the Church in its totality, but the Church idealised."⁽⁴⁾ However, in view of the correspondence with the 24 courses and the connection of the 24 elders with the temple and the ark of God's testament (11.16-19), their explicit claim to be priests (5.10), the reference to the altar in 6.9 and the tabernacle of witness (15.5)⁽⁵⁾ it is fairly safe to assume that John is

(1) The elders of Israel in Ex. 24.11; the 24 stars of the Babylonian astrology, the 12 Apostles and the 12 Patriarchs.

(2) And David divided them κατὰ τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν (24.3, cf. Ac. 1.20. He divided them κατὰ κλήρους (cf. Ac. 1.17: καὶ ἔλαχεν τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης)..... ὅτι ἦσαν ἄρχοντες τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἄρχοντες κυρίου (24.5) cf. II Esd. 6.18: καὶ ἔστησαν τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἐν διατερίσσειν αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς Λευίτας ἐν περισμοῖς αὐτῶν ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ Θεοῦ. The NT writers appear to have used διακονία instead of the interchangeable λειτουργία and δουλεία of the LXX.

(3) In I Chron. 16.4f. David is said to have appointed some of the Levites to serve before the ark of the covenant of whom Asaph was ἡγουμένος.

(4) The Apocalypse, p. 68.

(5) The elders' crowns of gold (4.4) are the Levites' golden crowns (Sir. 45.12). In I Chron. 25.3 only six of the ἄρχοντες strike up (ἐξομολόγησιν) on the harp but in Rev. 5.8 every one has a harp and a golden vial (one of the instruments of the service of Aaron and his sons in Num 4.14). Those who sit on the thrones in Rev. 20.4 have part in the first resurrection

thinking of these elders as the ἀρχοντες ἀγίων of I Chron. 24.5, the Levites of the church who serve in the tabernacle of testimony and are the guardians of the new testimony which is the new song of Jesus who is himself the new tabernacle of testimony (Jn.1.4); they are the leaders, the new order of Levites who 'taught and instructed the people in the law and in the knowledge of the Lord' (II Esd. 18.7f.; cf. Sir. 45.17).⁽¹⁾

Finally, the words of the prophecy of the Book of the Revelation are those of the true and faithful witness (19.11; cf. Mk. 12.14)⁽²⁾ and are themselves faithful and true (22.6); they are the water of life which is a free gift (22.17; cf. Is. 55.1).

and shall be priests of God and of Christ (20.6).

(1) "He (God) gave unto him (Aaron) by his commandments authority in the covenants of judgements to teach Jacob the testimonies (τὰ μαρτύρια) and to enlighten Israel with his law.

Bornkamm (KWB. VI, 668.14 - 670.11), seeking to maintain a difference between the organisation of the Jerusalem Church and that of the Hellenistic Church will not allow any conclusion from the 'twenty-four elder' passages as to the leadership of the latter. But while it is true that the Christian Church took over titles from the LXX it never regarded itself as Jewish but always as Christian. After all, the Pharisee party in Jerusalem was defeated in the Council reported in Ac. 15, and largely on the ruling of Peter and James. Bornkamm speaks of the Apocalypse giving a picture of a "pneumatisch-prophetisch geleiteten, nicht nach festern Ämtern verfassten Gemeinde" but the Jerusalem Church could claim to have the same character (Ac. 15.8 and esp. vv. 22,32 which show that the leaders were prophets). The real question is as to the nature of the authority of the leaders of both churches and the answer would seem to be that in both cases they had a charismatic teaching authority which rested on their doctrine and its power to elicit faith in Jesus Christ.

(2) "Teacher, we know that you are true and...teach the way of God in truth."

The Content of the Testimony

The four-fold content of the testimony of Jesus Christ is set forth at the very beginning of the book in 1.5-7; (a) He is the prince of the kings of the earth...to him glory and dominion for ever and ever; (b) the moral law is implicit in the reference to sins; (c) the redemptive action of God in Christ is seen in the sentence: He washed us from our sins in his own blood; (d) the promise is made: He comes with clouds and every eye shall see him. The same pattern may be seen in 3.14-21: (a) He is the beginning of the creation of God; (b) the church in Laodicea is rebuked for her lack of works which spring from devotion to the Lord; (b) His salvation is offered in 3.18 and (d) the promise is made in vv. 21f.

The Authority of the Witnesses

Jesus Christ himself, according to the Apocalypse, is the supreme witness, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός. (3.14, cf. 1.5, 19.11) whose testimony is faithful and true (21.5; cf. Ps. 18.8).⁽¹⁾ The probable source of the phrase 'the faithful witness' is in Ps. 88.19-37 where the Psalmist speaks of the coming anointed One who is chosen by God, God's servant with whom will be God's truth and mercy, the first-born of God, higher than the kings of the earth, whose throne will be established for ever, and as the faithful witness in heaven. The μάρτυς ἀληθινός means the witness in the

(1) ἡ μαρτυρία κυρίου πιστή, σοφίζουσα νῆπια.

highest, deepest, widest, most complete sense.⁽¹⁾ But Jesus' authority also is dependent on the word or revelation which is given to him by God (1.1) and with which his testimony is joined (1.2,9); he is the Amen (3.14), which stands for the faithful God, the יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ of Is. 65.16 which the LXX translates as ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἀληθινός who creates new heavens and a new earth. Jesus, according to the author of the Revelation is the beginning of this new creation (3.14), a thought which is also found in Prov. 8.22 where wisdom says: κύριος ἐκτίσεν με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ .

The rider on the white horse, another image of Jesus Christ, is called Πιστός καὶ Ἀληθινός (19.11) and his name, that is, his authority, is the word of God (19.13) for out of his mouth goes a sharp sword (19.15, cf. 1.16)⁽²⁾ so Jesus' authority is a teaching authority; he lays down the new torah for his disciples as is also seen in the reference to the keys in 1.18 and 3.7.

The author includes himself among the δούλοι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ; he is authorised by the command of the Lord while he is in the Spirit. There is no indication that he has any official position and his authority is that of his message.⁽³⁾ John is the writer of the message (1.4) but it is the Spirit who speaks and who can be heard by those who have an ear (2.7 etc.).⁽⁴⁾

(1) Cf. Trench, Synonyms, pp. 27f.

(2) The sword is often a symbol for the word of the Spirit of God (Is. 49.2; Eph. 6.17; cf. Heb. 4.12; Hos. 6.5).

(3) Cf. Asting, Die Verkündigung, pp. 654f.

(4) That is, those whose ears God opens. Dt. 29.3; II K. 7.27; cf. Is. 50.5; Mk. 7.33ff.

In chap. 10 the author is told by the angel to eat up the little book which has associations with the judgements of God (cf. Ps. 18.7-11) and the λόγια of God which are also sweeter than honey (cf. Ps. 118.103); having been so instructed, John is told that he must prophesy (that is, testify) again before many peoples and nations and tongues and kings (10.11; cf. Ps. 118.46). The Apocalyptist is one of the servants and brethren who have within them the testimony of Jesus (cf. I Jn. 5.10) which is the spirit of prophecy (19.10); he is thus distinguished from the generality of Christians, those who keep the sayings of the book (1.3; 22.9); he is one of the charismatic,⁽¹⁾ prophetic ministry.⁽²⁾

Finally, the authority of the writer, here called an ἀγγελος is imparted by Jesus himself who has sent⁽³⁾ him to testify (22.16). Thus he speaks with the authority of Jesus who is the root⁽⁴⁾ and offspring of David⁽⁵⁾ and the bright and morning star, the foremost of all the witnesses or teachers and prophets, "the brightest of the whole galaxy," the light which lightens every man who comes into the world".⁽⁶⁾

(1) Swete (The Apocalypse, p. 306): "the Spirit of prophecy, the Spirit in the prophetic order; 'the Spirit and the Bride' is thus practically equivalent to 'the prophets and the Saints' (xvi.6, xviii.24).

(2) Swete (op. cit., p. 299) quotes Arethas relevantly: τοῦτο γὰρ βούλεται παριστᾶν διὰ τοῦ 'Κύριος τῶν πνευμάτων', ὡς περὶ ἐλέγεν 'Κύριος τοῦ προφητικοῦ χαρίσματος'.

(3) E.g. Jn. 1.6, 33; 6.57 etc.

(4) Cf. Sir. 1.6: εἶσα σοφίας τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη.

(5) Cf. Is. 11.1. "The Beginning and the End of the whole economy associated with the Davidic family." (Swete, The Apocalypse, p. 306).

(6) Swete: op. cit., p. 306.

This is the one by whom the testimony or prophecy of the book is attested (22.20).

The use of the singular pronoun *σὺ* (2.2,9,14,19; 3.1,8,15 etc.) shows that the Angels of the Seven Churches were definite people to whom the letters were addressed; they are obviously people of authority in the Church⁽¹⁾ for they try those who claim to be apostles (2.2); they have power to deal with false teachers (2.14f.,20). These angels have already been described as stars (1.16,20), a conception found in Dan.12.3 in this connection.⁽²⁾ In II Chron. 36.15 the prophets are directly referred to as *ἄγγελοι*.⁽³⁾ These leaders of the

(1) Cf. Str/Bill. III, p. 791: "Man wird...unter den *ἄγγελοι* Menschen zu verstehen haben, die *ἄγγελοι* τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν genannt werden, weil sie Gottes Gesandte, Beauftragte, Bevollmächtigte im Dienste an den Gemeinden waren, d.h. Männer, die in den Gemeinden an leitender Stelle standen. Ähnlich wird Hag.1,13 der Prophet und Mal.2,7 der Priester ein *ἄγγελος* ein Gottesbote (LXX *ἄγγελος* κυρίου) genannt, und im Rabbinischen erscheinen nicht nur die Priester als Gottes *ἄγγελοι* (= *ἄγγελοι*, *ἀπόστολοι*), d.h. als Gottes Boten und Beauftragte, sondern jeder konnte als Gottes *ἄγγελος* (= *ἄγγελος*, *ἀπόστολος*) bezeichnet werden, der in irgendeiner göttlichen Sendung einherging."

(2) There would seem to be a very strong connection between Rev. 1.20: οἱ ἑπτὰ ἀστέρες ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν εἰσὶν and Dan. 11.33: καὶ ἐννοούμενοι τοῦ ἔθνους συνήσουσιν εἰς πολλοὺς (Θ: καὶ οἱ συνετοὶ τοῦ λαοῦ συνήσουσιν εἰς πολλὰ) and Dan.12.3: καὶ οἱ συνιέντες φανούσιν ὡς φωστῆρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ οἱ κατισχύοντες τοὺς λόγους μου ὥσει τὰ ἀστὲρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. (Θ: καὶ οἱ συνιέντες ἐκλάμπουσιν ὡς ἡ λαμπρότης τοῦ στερεώματος καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν δικαίων τῶν πολλῶν ὡς οἱ ἀστέρες). The Hebrew has "they that be wise (AV margin has 'teachers') shall shine as the brightness of the firmament and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars". Cf. IV Ezra. 8.29; Mt.5.15f; Phil.2.15f. and Jude 13 where false teachers are called *ἀστέρες* πλανῆται.

(3) Cf. Mal.2.7: ὅτι χεῖλη ἱερέως φυλάσσεται γνῶσιν, καὶ νόμον ἐκζητήσουσιν ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ, διότι ἄγγελος κυρίου παντοκράτορος ἐστίν. Is.44.26

churches, however, depend for their authority on the testimony of Jesus. The leader at Ephesus is rebuked for having left his first love, and indeed will lose his position unless he remembers and does the first works (that is, teaches the original doctrines) (2.4f.). He is urged to be faithful unto death and then he will be given a crown of life, a thought which is close to that of Mt.24.13, a verse which immediately precedes Jesus' statement about the gospel being preached for a μαρτύριον until the end comes. The angel of Pergamos is commended for holding fast Jesus' name and not denying his faith. Antipas, presumably his predecessor, is called ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός. (If this phrase means 'Antipas the martyr' there would really be no need for the phrase ὃς ἀπεκτάνθη παρ' ὑμῶν). This leader is reproved for allowing some of the congregation to teach false doctrine (2.14f.). This fault is shared by the angel of Thyatira who has not silenced the false prophetess Jezebel (2.20) and is told that he must keep Jesus' words to the end. The angel of Philadelphia has done well in keeping the word of Jesus' patience and in not denying his name (3.8,10). Any authority referred to is to be possessed in the future (e.g. 2.26; 3.12,21) and there is no emphasis on position in the existing church. The angels are the teachers of the Church who, by virtue of their knowledge, faith and testimony, are leaders. Teachers who do not hold the testimony of Jesus are to be avoided.

speaks of God confirming the word of his servant and verifying the counsel of his messengers.

The 24 elders have been shown to have some connection with the teaching and guarding of the torah and this is also to some extent true of the 4 living creatures in 4.6. These are related to the ones in Ezek. 1.5 which are identified with the cherubim in Ezek. 9.3; 10.2ff., 20ff. The cherubim, according to Gen. 3.24, guard the way (!) of the tree of life (!)⁽¹⁾ and their images, between which God spoke his commands through Moses (Ex. 25.21f.) are immediately above the ark of testimony and were also placed in the holy of holies in Solomon's temple. This connection of the cherubim with torah, knowledge is confirmed by Philo.⁽²⁾

There seems to be no special difference between the various brethren, souls, servants, saints, apostles and prophets who have died for the testimony of Jesus for the remnant of the woman's seed are indeed brethren. The important thing for John is not the distinction between classes and orders, or functions and offices, or cleric and lay in the Church but simply that all should be steadfast in upholding the word of God, the testimony of Jesus.

(1) That is, the teaching of Christ; cf. Jud. 2.22; Ps. 36.34 etc. and above p. 433, note 2.

(2) Vit. Mos. II.97: ἃ πατεῖω μὲν γλώττῃ προσαναγορεύεται Χερουβίμ, ὡς δὲ ἂν Ἕλληνες ἔποιεν, ἐπίγνωσις καὶ ἐπιστήμη πολλή. (Loeb ed. Vol. VI. p. 496).

The Authority of the Testimony

According to this author the testimony of Jesus, that is, his message⁽¹⁾ is the ultimate authority for everyone and, as has been seen in the books already discussed, this is seen to be a spiritual gift which abides or, rather, can abide with him who receives it;⁽²⁾ it is the new torah of the new covenant.

In 1.16 the one like the Son of Man is described as having a sharp two-edged sword coming out of his mouth which indicates that his words are those of the Servant (see Is. 49.2f.) and therefore are inspired by the Spirit.⁽³⁾ The revelation or prophecy of Jesus Christ is given to him by God (1.1) and the little book which is the basis of the author's prophecy is a gift (10.7-11). The basis of the prophesying of the two witnesses is a gift of God (11.3).⁽⁴⁾

When John received the revelation he was 'in the Spirit' (1.10), a phrase which, while it can denote the exalted state of the ecstatic, does not necessarily imply that prophet's vision cannot be translated into understandable terms, for the letters to the seven churches are remarkably straightforward in meaning. John's words to the churches are what the Spirit says (2.7 etc.)⁽⁵⁾ and the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy (19.10). The spirit of prophecy is the teaching gift poured

(1) Cf. Zahn, Introduction. Vol. 2. pp. 377ff. note 2, and Kittel (KWB. IV, 126. 5-11): "Beides, ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ und μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ sind vorgegebene Grössen...die bezeugte Gegebenheit".

(2) Cf. Asting (Die Verkündigung, p. 654): "Wenn ausdrücklich von einem 'Haben' des Zeugnisses Jesu geredet wird, so bedeutet das, dass Jesu Zeugnis ein bleibendes Eigentum, ein dauernder Zustand ist, etwas, an dem diejenigen, von denen die Rede ist, festhalten. - Jesus offenbart sich ihnen."

(3) Cf. Is. 61.1; Lk. 4.18; Eph. 6.17; II Thess. 2.8; Heb. 4.12; Rev. 2.12, 16; 19.15.

(4) Swete (The Apocalypse, p. 131): Δώσω...καὶ προφητεύσουσιν = δώσω αὐτοῖς προφητεύειν or ἵνα προφητεύσωσιν.

(5) Cf. Swete (The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, p. 277): "the two are in practice identical. To be a true prophet is to

out upon the witnesses of Jesus at Pentecost and foretold by Joel, viz. the testimony of Jesus, the message of God's salvation which the teacher has within him.⁽¹⁾ In the previous passage (19.1-9) the Church, the wife of the Lamb, is said to have been given fine linen clothing which is τὰ δίκαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων (19.8).⁽²⁾ The idea of 'the spirit of prophecy' is found, significantly, in the accounts in Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy of the appointing of Moses' 70 elder-assistants who are to judge small matters while the large are reserved for himself, e.g. Ex. 18.20,22: καὶ διαμαρτυρεῖ αὐτοῖς τὰ προστάγματα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὸν νόμον αὐτοῦ καὶ σημανεῖς αὐτοῖς τὰς ὁδοὺς, ἐν αἷς πορεύσονται ἐν αὐταῖς, καὶ τὰ ῥέγα, ἃ ποιήσουσιν. καὶ κρινούσιν τὸν λαὸν πᾶσαν ὥραν.

witness to Jesus and to witness to Jesus is to have the prophetic spirit; testimony is the raison d'être of prophecy." (1) Cf. I Jn.5.10; I Tim. 4.14. Viller (Recherches de Science Religieuse, p. 550) is wrong in saying: "ce n'est point évidemment qu'à tous fut donné un charisme permanent; une assistance transitoire suffisait."

(2) Δικαιώματα does not mean 'righteousness' (AV) or 'righteous deeds' (NEB) but, in accordance with LXX usage, 'laws; cf. Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 142: "it is doubtful if δικαίωμα can quite = 'a righteous act'." Cf. LXX passages where torah or μαρτυρία is closely associated with δικαίωμα: Num. 15.16, Dt. 4.45; 6.17 (cf. Rev. 16.15); IV K.23.3; Ps.118.12,14,16; 118.24 and 131.9-16 where it is said: "Thy priests shall clothe themselves with righteousness; and thy saints shall exult.....if thy sons will keep my covenant and these my testimonies which I shall teach themI will clothe her priests with salvation and her saints will rejoice exceedingly."

(cf. Dt. 16.18; 17.8-13); they are the πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἄξεις αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου, καὶ στήσονται ἐκεῖ μετὰ σοῦ. (Num. 11.16); these received from God some of the spirit which was upon Moses and when the spirit rested upon them⁽¹⁾ they prophesied, and continued to do so. That is to say they received a spiritual gift of expertness in the torah which remained with them as a permanent possession.⁽²⁾ It is doubtful if the λόγοι ἀληθινοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ of Rev. 19.9 is a reference to the testimony although it is tempting to take the phrase in this way, especially as it recurs in fuller form as οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί (21.5; 22.6), the testimony of Jesus, the true and faithful witness.

The above evidence is sufficient to show that the testimony of Jesus is a gift of the Spirit which gives the bearer a spiritual authority. This authority has no external sanction; the letters to the 7 churches show that it depends for its acceptance on its own merit.

(1) Ἐπαναπαύεσθαι = 'to settle upon', 'to fix one's abode upon' (Grimm-Thayer, p. 228).

(2) Cf. Dt. 16.8 and Asting (Die Verkündigung, p. 655): "πνεῦμα muss nicht zur Bedeutung einer blossen 'Geistesrichtung' oder Ähnliches abgeschwächt werden. Es bezeichnet Gottes Geist, der Gottes Offenbarung vermittelt." Günther (Μάρτυς, pp. 128f.) distinguishes between the first and second μαρτυρία in Rev. 19.10 taking the first to mean the missionary preaching and linking the second with the martyrdom of the apocalyptic witness. His position is weakened however by the fact that in both cases it is the testimony of Jesus which G. has already (pp. 125f.) designated as John's term for early Christian missionary testimony, distinguishing it from 'the testimony of Jesus Christ' which he claims is the phrase used by John for apocalyptic testimony. Charles (The Revelation, p. 130) reckons that μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ here should naturally be subjective genitive - 'the testimony borne by Jesus' but that the γὰρ clause makes the other interpretation necessary (he does not explain why!). The verb εἶχον would seem to provide a weightier argument for the subj. gen.

The Transmission of the Testimony

The author of the Revelation is as anxious as all the other NT writers to preserve the testimony of Jesus in its original content and this comes out clearly in several passages. Those who read and hear and keep the words of the prophecy of the book are blessed (1.3; 22.7). The angel of the church at Ephesus has many commendable characteristics but he arouses the writer's opposition because he has left his first love (2.4), ⁽¹⁾ and he is told that he must do the first works, that is the torah or testimony which is from the beginning (cf. I Jn.2.7). The angel at Pergamos has endangered the tradition by tolerating false teachers (2.14f.). The angel at Thyatira is also at fault because he has allowed the spread of heretical doctrine (2.20-24) and those who have not fallen away are urged to hold fast the teaching, the orthodox faith which they have (2.24f.). The angel of Sardis is upbraided for having the Lord on his lips but not in his heart, ⁽²⁾ He also must remember ⁽³⁾ what he has received and heard and hold, i.e. guard it ⁽⁴⁾ as all God's faithful witnesses have done. A

(1) II Jn.6 shows that love is 'walking in God's commandments', or 'teaching' (v.9) for many deceivers had entered into the world who did not confess that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh (cf. Heb.4.1,2,6,11,14: "lest any may fall after the same example of unbelief...let us hold fast our profession" and Heb. 6.4-6; II Pet.1.10,12; 3.17f.)

(2) Cf. Herm. Sim. 9.21.1-4.

(3) Cf. Dahl (Stud. Theol. I and II (1947/48), p. 76: "La pensée qu'il s'agissait pour les fidèles de conserver l'Evangile originel et la mémoire de l'héritage des apôtres fut d'une importance primordiale dans la lutte contre les hérésies naissantes.

(4) τηρεῖν = φυλάσσειν. (a) It is used in the LXX to translate תִּשְׁמֹר in Ca. 8.11f. and φυλάσσειν is used in Ca.1.6.

(b) τηρεῖν = שָׁמַר in Prov.2.11; 3.1f. etc. and φυλάσσειν = שָׁמַר in IV K. 18.8; Prov. 2.8; 4.13 etc. (c) τηρεῖν = שָׁמַר in Prov. 16.17 and φυλάσσειν = שָׁמַר in Prov. 19.27; Hab.3.16.

(d) τηρεῖν = שָׁמַר in II Esd.8.29; Prov.19.16 etc. and φυλάσσειν = שָׁמַר in Gen.2.15; Prov. 4.5 etc.

few individuals in Sardis have not defiled their garments, that is, have not corrupted the δικαιώματα (cf. 19.8). The reference in 3.3 to the Lord coming as a thief at a time unknown is reminiscent of Lk. 12.39f. which is part of a warning to Jesus' stewards and servants to be faithful and wise (Lk. 12.42f.). The angel of Philadelphia receives the approval of the Lord because he has kept his word, has not denied his name and has kept the word of his patience (3.8,10); he also is to hold fast what he has (3.11).

The author of the Revelation regards his own book as part of the faithful and true testimony (22.6,16) and "he who keeps the sayings of the prophecy of this book is blessed". The injunction concerning the preservation of the original prophecy and the warning to anyone who adds to or subtracts from it are the same as that of Moses with regard to the OT torah (Dt. 4.2,9; 13.1; 29.19; cf. Josh. 1.7; Prov. 30.6 and Mt. 15.9).

Conclusion

According to the Book of the Revelation the witnesses are the teachers or prophets of the Church who receive their inspiration from Jesus Christ the true and faithful witness and who are the representatives of the whole witnessing Church. The testimony is that which Jesus himself was and taught; it is the new song which is linked with and fulfils the Song of Moses and shows intrinsically the same content.

The authority of the witnesses depends on the word which is given to them by God and so is charismatic and prophetic. Although the angels of the churches are addressed as those responsible for the faith and action of their congregations, authority does not appear to attach in greater degree to any one class of leader mentioned in the book.

The testimony is the new torah of the new covenant, the revelation or prophecy which is given to the witness by God and has no external sanction; it is a charisma which can be expressed in definite terms. The tradition has been endangered by false teachers and so the author calls on his readers to hold fast the doctrine and continue to labour for the faith of Christ which they have received and learned that others may hear Christ's voice and open the door so that the Lord may enter and sup with them and they with him. Anyone who adds to or subtracts from the testimony will be excluded from the life of Jesus Christ, the faithful witness for whose return the Church is yearning.

CHAPTER XVIICONCLUSION

From the foregoing study it can be seen that the μαρτυρία-concept is, in L. Cerfaux' words, "une idée-force primordiale" and must be a key-word in any study of authority in religion and in the Church.

Much discussion has centred round the riddle of the transition of the meaning of the word μαρτυρ from 'witness' to 'martyr'. On the one hand the attempt has been made to show that the basic meaning is that of 'eye-witness of an event' and that this idea is always included in the development; on the other hand the idea of suffering has been taken as fundamental and attempts have been made to show that this has been present from the beginning in the picture of the μαρτυρ. Neither of these positions is strictly correct for the μαρτυρ of Jesus is not always an eye-witness of his earthly life and, in the second place, suffering is the destiny rather than the function of the true Israel.

The present thesis rests on the view, generally accepted but not always taken into consideration, that the root of the μαρτυρ word-group stems from the Sanscrit root which produces the words for 'remembering', 'reminding' and the like. This means that in profane usage the legal witness will be someone who remembers and repeats what he has seen or heard and the prophetic witness is someone who remembers and reminds others of the testimony of God, the revelation of God. This revelation is inseparable from events in this world which may be experienced through sense-perception and through the normal processes of reasoning minds and so the prophet is a witness

in two senses: (a) he is a witness of facts, he tells the story of what he has seen with his eyes and heard with his ears, and so confronts his hearers with the phenomena which he himself experienced. It is important to note that the simple eye-witness cannot prove that his testimony is true; it has to be believed. By the same token eye-witness testimony cannot be used to prove the truth of a proposition. (b) The *μάρτυς* is a witness of the truth; that is to say, he interprets the historical phenomena, he sees the hand of God in the events, hears the Word of God in the words. The event to which he testifies then becomes salvation-event to the one who hears the testimony and responds to the corresponding testimony of the Holy Spirit in his mind, just as it became salvation-event to the eye-witness when he saw, heard and believed; but not before he believed. The interpretation is possible only because God has revealed himself by and within the events; e.g. the events of the Exodus were historical but were interpreted by Moses as the work of God. The testimony of the *μάρτυς* is the story of the events with their interpretation and the prophet or priest who is commissioned by God to remind his fellows of this testimony is said to testify. In testifying, the prophet or *μάρτυς* must present the historical events for without them there is no objective medium for the truth which he claims to have 'seen' in them; he must also give his interpretation of the events and call for a decision by his hearers. The second-generation prophet cannot be called an eye-or ear-witness (even though Joshua tells his generation that they saw the events of the Exodus) but, having heard the eye-witness testimony and having believed it and the interpretation of it he is now 'in possession of the facts' and can testify, that is he can lay the facts and their interpretation before his

hearers and call for a decision. It is evident that the testimony of the eye-witnesses of the original events is of extreme importance since the historical events are the locus or medium of God's revelation of his own nature, his law, his redemptive love and his purposes but eye-witness testimony as such does not furnish proof of spiritual truths.

The New Testament witnesses testify to Jesus Christ who is both event and truth and the gospel is grounded on the testimony of the apostles who proclaim and teach a message which inspires hope, elicits faith and leads to loving action. The authority of the apostles does not lie in the fact that they were eye-witnesses of the life, teaching, death and resurrection of Jesus - there were others who had also had this experience - but in the fact that what they say is in line with prophetic truth from the beginning and, because of the testimony of the Holy Spirit, receives an answering echo in the mind of the hearer who believes. The world is more or less agreed about the simple facts of the life of Jesus except, perhaps, the event called the resurrection which can scarcely be called an historical fact. The authority of the apostles is spiritual.

There are those who would say that it is necessary to look behind the kerygma or testimony in the previous history for the foundation of faith but 'foundation' is surely the wrong word here. It is certainly true that the words and works of Jesus carry and always will carry a great deal of interest for the Church which followed the apostles because Jesus was a real person who spoke particular words and behaved in a particular way and had a particular effect on people; he was anything but a disembodied truth. The whole New Testament is witness to Jesus of Nazareth and not to a featureless personification of goodness and truth or to someone who may be anyone and therefore

is no one in particular. His words and works must be known by subsequent generations so that they may recognise the Holy Spirit and trust Jesus and imitate him. It must be stressed, however, that any interest in the history behind the kerygma should not be taken with a view to bolstering up faith in God so that it might have more 'historical certainty'. Even if it were possible for men today to have a tape-recording of the words and a film of the life of Jesus no one would be any nearer to having proof of the truth of the gospel; the question would still have to be asked and answered: "Is this man indeed very God in the flesh and are his words indeed very truth?". On the other hand, the more information in the form of eye-witness testimony to events and words there is available, the more responsibility is laid on the one to whom the question is put.

Bultmann and his school forbid any attempt to go behind the kerygma for the historical tradition, for then the eschatological event is drawn into the relativity of all historical knowledge. To this it may be replied that it is precisely this 'relativity of the historical' which gives faith its essentially indecisive character. The faith of the apostles sprang from their awareness of the spiritual significance of historical phenomena and in their testimony to these phenomena they present to later generations the same history; they preached Jesus, not some generalised Christ.

The usage of the $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ -group in the Old Testament makes it clear that the $\mu\alpha\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ is really the doctrine of God and that the $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is the messenger, apostle, prophet, teacher sent by God to remind men of the original testimony given by God to Israel when he entered into covenant relationship with his people. The essential character of God's testimony is seen

in the Song of Moses (see Dt. 31 and 32) which is explicitly referred to as a μαρτύριον to Israel. This testimony is given by the Spirit of God; it has many synonyms, the most important of which is νόμος = תּוֹרָה = teaching, which might be best expressed by the English word 'lore'. Moses and the people whom he led out of Egypt were eye-witnesses of the events which 'carried' the revelation of the word of God and great stress was laid on the duty of testifying, that is, of teaching and preserving this fixed body of revelation-doctrine. The testimony is also the principal concern of the writers of the Jewish Wisdom literature which gives it many names to denote spiritual instruction.

The content of this Mosaic and prophetic testimony is constant throughout and is set forth in four great themes, viz., (a) the Sovereignty of the one true God, the creator of all, (b) the Moral Law of God, (c) his Redemptive Activity in history and (d) his Promise of eternal blessedness for the faithful and eternal doom for the disobedient. This four-fold testimony remains constant throughout the whole of the Old Testament scriptures, the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha and the Scrolls of the Dead Sea Sect. The testimony of John the Baptist and that of Jesus himself follow the same pattern, with the claim added that Jesus is the fulfilment and embodiment of it, he is the Lord, the way, the ransom and the resurrected one who is to come. Just as in the old dispensation the testimony of God was preserved and handed on by Moses, the priests, the prophets and the psalmists so in the new the testimony of Jesus is guarded and transmitted by his disciples and by the succeeding generations of the faithful.

The preservation of the testimony and its transmission to following generations of Israelites is the official responsibility of the priests and Levites, the sons of Aaron with whom are linked the official prophets as the teachers of the tradition⁽¹⁾ but from time to time these are guilty of allowing the testimony to be forgotten or corrupted and then God raises up non-official prophets or teachers to recall Israel to the covenant and testimony, to the true way of God. The teaching priests and prophets have an official authority by virtue of their heredity and their ordination but this authority is completely dependent on their loyalty to the teaching for which they are responsible. When they neglect or misrepresent the testimony they are called false witnesses, false prophets, false teachers.

In exilic and post-exilic times Isaiah sees Israel as the witness, sometimes as the whole people of God, sometimes as a remnant and sometimes as an individual. Plural and singular are almost interchangeable when Isaiah refers to the Servant who is to teach the nations the truth about God.

Not all who speak in God's name speak God's word and the false prophets and witnesses are such and are recognisable as such because they distort, add to or subtract from the testimony. When the official religious leaders act in this way their authority becomes a pernicious and dangerous thing and the true witness must be prepared to give his life that the tradition may be preserved. This is also true when the witness is persecuted by the secular powers but opposition to these

(1) Lev. 10.11; II Chron. 15.3; Is. 9.15; 28.7; Jer. 5.31; 6.13; 23.11; 33.7; 39.32f.

powers is called for only when the μαρτύριον is threatened. The behaviour of the true and faithful witness under these conditions is illustrated dramatically in the Maccabaeian stories of Eleazar and the mother and her seven sons.

In the Jewish apocryphal and apocalyptic literature and in that of the Dead Sea Sect the testimony is seen to have the same four-fold content and to be a technical term for doctrinal instruction; in the Mishna Tractate: Eduyoth the term is used for the traditional teaching of the Sages.

The roots of the NT concept of testimony lie deep in the OT and, judging from the close verbal similarity of so many witness-passages, the LXX appears to have been employed to a great extent by the composers of the NT documents. The present study has encouraged the conclusion that there is no essential distinction between the testimony of God in the OT and that borne in the NT except that the latter presents Jesus as the fulfilment of it so that salvation is not just a future hope but a present reality for those who believe in him. The prophetic μαρτύριον of the OT has the same basic four-fold content as that of Jesus and his witnesses and apostles, the prophets and teachers of the NT.

Jesus is the prophet who is himself the fulfilment of prophecy, the servant of God who is the embodiment of Israel, the true and faithful witness who is embodiment of the testimony. His life and teaching have the same four aspects as the OT testimony: (a) His mighty acts are parables of the creative power of God; (b) his teaching is the fulfilment of the law, not a replacement of it; (c) his sacrificial death on the Cross is the climax of the salvation-work of God and (d) his resurrection is the earnest of the resurrection of all men either to life or to judgement. His authority is spiritually

conferred and discerned as was that of all the prophets from Moses to John the Baptist. Jesus cannot prove his claims; he can only adduce witnesses such as the scriptures, his own works, God, his own messianic self-consciousness; his is the authority of the one who speaks the truth which may be accepted or rejected.

The disciples of Jesus render his testimony, the substance of his teaching (which includes his actions), according to his Spirit. Their authority is like that of the Levitical priesthood which had the duty of preserving the testimony and passing it on to successive generations. Where the officially constituted teachers tamper with the testimony they forfeit their position. The apostles who were companions of Jesus during his life on earth are in a similar position to Moses and his contemporaries who saw the events of the Exodus, saw the glory of God and received the testimony. The historical events and the words of Jesus must be preserved for they 'carry' the possibility of revelation. The works and words of Jesus of Nazareth, that is Jesus' person, are the essential testimony which the apostles teach in their ministry of the word; they also in a true sense are ministers of the tabernacle of testimony which is Jesus himself (Jn. 1.14) and they pass on faithfully the essential testimony so that their hearers may be confronted by Jesus as they had been in the beginning and thus may confess him as Lord or reject him.

The apostles receive the testimony by the Spirit of God and their authority as office-bearers in the Church is that of the teacher, spiritually commissioned, bearing the unchanging message, recognised by the Church; their testimony guarantees their call rather than the reverse. The witness of God has no sanctions other than the work of the Holy Spirit in the mind

of his hearer, rousing faith in the message. Just as in OT times the official priests and prophets could not claim a higher authority than that of the unofficial prophet, so the apostles cannot claim a higher authority than that of other teachers who are faithful to the testimony of Jesus. The NT witness is the teacher of the testimony of Jesus even though he may not have seen Jesus in the flesh.

The elders, deacons, episkopoi, prophets, teachers and others are also counterparts of the Levites in their service of the tabernacle of testimony; they are simply interdependent members of the one body of Christ; there is no real order of precedence in the NT Church. Each Christian receives his gift and ministers it; the officers are charismatics and their function is to cherish and pass on the testimony.

The discussion about office in the Church is thus illuminated by the *μάετρος* -concept which supports the view of the charismatic nature of all authority in the early Church; the Catholic view is seen to rest on a desire for authority in order to preserve the testimony rather than on the idea that it is the testimony which itself carries whatever religious authority the teacher of it possesses. It is significant that it was at a time when the apostles and prophets were dying out and the claims of the bishops were being pressed that the meaning of *μάετρος* began to pass from that of 'prophet' or 'teacher' to that of 'martyr'. The office-bearers of the first churches were recognised as being also office-bearers of the Church as a whole, as long as they were faithful to the gospel, and the whole church judged as to whether they were abiding in the doctrine or not.

Any authority which the Church has as an institution is a teaching-authority; she has a message to proclaim, a doctrine to teach, viz. that God has spoken and acted in time and space, in the man Jesus. The witness says: "Something has happened in days gone by, it has happened to succeeding generations, it has happened to me, it can happen to you; repent and believe the testimony." Any authority possessed by an office-bearer in the church he has by virtue of the message he bears.

The message, the testimony of the Church, is a given thing which, in essence, is static but which, ever and again, is given new life and new application in the unfolding situations in which the Church finds herself. The testimony is a charisma but it is not a sudden, effervescent inspiration, rather is it a fixed tradition, the testimony of Jesus, the testimony Jesus taught, and it departs from its possessor only when he forgets it or wilfully dismisses it or perverts it.

The *πάρετος* is trained in the testimony and ordained by the church but he is always under obligation to remain faithful to the testimony, as indeed are all the saints.

Additional Note (A)Aspects of the Discussion of the *μάρτυς*-Concept since 1859

The main interest of the discussion on the *μάρτυς*-concept since 1859 until recently has lain in the problem of the development of the meaning from 'witness' to 'martyr'.

GASS (1859) found the beginning of this development in Rev. 2.13; 17.6 "weil das ganze Buch den Beginn der Verfolgungen voraussetzt". (p. 327).

KATTENBUSCH (1903) may, however, be regarded as the real originator of the discussion; he realised that the testifying leads to martyrdom rather than the reverse; he claimed that the later general usage was based on a misunderstanding of Rev. 1.5 etc. in I Clem. 5.4 but concludes that the title remains a riddle.

GEFFKEN (1910) found the origin and prototype of the *μάρτυς* in Epictetus and held that it means 'martyr' in Ac. 1.8; 22.20; Rev. 2.13; 17.6 etc.

HARNACK (1910) showed importantly that the real martyrs made long speeches and that what they spoke was God's word.

ALLARD (1909) claimed that martyrdom is a testimony given by means of suffering to prove the divinity of Christianity and that the word martyr had received this technical meaning before the end of the apostolic age. He denied that we can be witnesses of our own opinions but only of facts and that the Church became the Christian fact.

LABERTHONIERE (1906/7) in reply to Allard stressed that most importantly the martyrs confess their faith in Jesus Christ: "C'est quand on s'est élevé par la foi au point de vue de l'éternité qu'on dit avec S. Jean en parlant du Christ, 'nous avons vu et touché le Verbe de vie,' tandis que les Juifs, eux, n'avaient vu qu'un corps comme les autres corps." (p. 72).

LABRIOLLE (1911) made the point: "l'homme qui, pour certifier la vérité d'un fait, d'une doctrine, ou sa foi en un être supérieur, va jusqu'à accepter les tourments et la mort, celui-là est par excellence le 'témoin' de cet être, de cette doctrine, de ce fait." (pp. 50f.).

HOLL (1914, 1916, 1917, 1921), in the light of Ac. 22.15, 20 with 7.56; I Cor. 15.5-8, saw μάρτυς as a title of honour for the apostles since they were eye-witnesses of the mighty acts of Christ and especially of the resurrection. He made the important point that the ψευδομάρτυς can only mean 'the counterfeit prophet'.

CORSSSEN (1915, 1916) derived the martyr-title from the confession before the judge and brought forward the auxiliary idea of the Christian as the slave of Christ testifying under torture for his master.

SCHLATTER (1915) agreed with Holl about the influence of the Maccabean struggle on the idea of the μάρτυς and insisted that everywhere in the NT the word means 'witness'.

REITZENSTEIN (1916, 1917) rejected Holl's view altogether and saw the confession before the Judge as the proclamation by the Christian, the messenger of God, of his Christian conviction; and he saw a close connection between μάρτυς and κήρυξ. R. was at fault in agreeing with Geffken that contemporary Hellenistic philosophy influenced the usage of μάρτυς but correctly noted that Ignatius, who would have had every reason to use the word if it had meant 'martyr' in this day, omits the use of it in this sense.

KRÜGER (1916) also opposed Holl's idea of the μάρτυς τῆς ἀναστάσεως being a title for an apostle, and with Geffken and Reitzenstein, favoured the influence of Hellenism, especially Epictetus.

The controversy between Holl on the one hand and Corssen, Reitzenstein and Krüger on the other concerning ψευδομάρτυρες in I Cor. 15.15 has no direct bearing on the present thesis. Whether Paul and the others are calling themselves 'lying witnesses' or pseudo-witnesses it all comes to the same thing if the μάρτυς is regarded as a teacher of the testimony so that authority rests on his fidelity to the teaching and upon its inherent power to convince the hearer. If the witnesses include the resurrection of Jesus in their testimony and the opposing teaching is true, viz. that there is no general resurrection, then they are lying witnesses because they are saying something which is not true and they are claiming to have seen something which could not have taken place and by the same token they are false witnesses in the sense of false prophets who cannot claim to have a commission from the God of truth and life.

The view of DORNSEIFF (1923/25) is that the germ of the idea which has developed lies in the suffering Servant theme of Deutero-Isaiah. For D. the *πάερος* is the one who brings the proof that Jesus is the Messiah and also brings evidence against the enemies of the Gospel.

VILLER (1924, 1925) quotes Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 16.20 to show how the Montanists regarded their martyrs as prophets but he interprets *μαρτύριον* in Mt. 10.18 in terms of martyrdom and states that the first and fundamental aspect of the martyr is his imitation of Christ.

RIDDLE (1924) regards the *μαρτύριον* passages in the Gospels as 'pragmatic teaching' concerning martyrdom instead of treating them as the actual words of Jesus. R. has difficulty in seeing how Jesus could foresee the persecution of the Church but this is really not so unlikely if he knew that the Jewish leaders were planning his own death.

DELEHAYE (1927) introduces the idea of the authority of the official witness, the apostle who has been commissioned by the Master to bear testimony: "Les apôtres, propagateurs de l'évangile, sont donc les témoins autorisés, on pourrait dire officiels, du grand fait que le Christ a donné comme preuve de sa mission: la résurrection (p. 77). D. regards Mk. 13.9 and Lk. 21.12 as being "dans le cadre des Actes des Martyres" and I Tim. 6.13 as necessarily recalling the image of the blood-witness. Concerning Mt. 10.18-30 he takes the orthodox Roman standpoint: "L'on pourrait faire remarquer ici que l'inspiration qui lui est promise, place le chrétien appelé à rendre compte de sa foi, dans l'état prophétique. On ne voit pas, pourtant, que jamais martyrs ou confesseurs aient été, à n'importe quel moment, qualifiés de prophètes;" this, of course, neglects the evidence of Rev. 19.10.

LOHMEYER (1927) sees testifying and suffering as inextricably connected, this connection being grounded in the conception of the conflict between the servants of God and those of the false gods; the *πάερος* is the representative of God and the substitute for the people of God.

FITZER (1928) also derives the martyr-idea from Deutero-Isaiah as a factor in the opposition between God and the world; the *πάερος* testifies that God is the Lord and so is persecuted and must suffer and die.

MICHEL (1932, 1935) holds correctly that the prophet stands as God's witness for the truth with an authority which can be questioned. According to M. the prophets are the spirit-bearers but he makes no mention of the underlying idea of teaching in the μαρτυρ-^{ος}-group which runs through the whole of the Bible and he seems to think that because the substantive itself is infrequently used it has the special meaning of 'martyr'.

STAUFFER (1933) also bases his conception of the μαρτυρ-^{ος} on the age-old contest between a divine and a demonic order.

CASEY recognises several developments of the meaning of μαρτυρία in the NT; these strands are: (a) witness to the truth of the Gospel (Mk.13.9), (b) witness against the enemies of the Gospel (Mk.6.11), both being included in the missionary work of the disciples and (c) a special usage in Luke-Acts which stresses the eye-witness testimony to the resurrection and includes Paul and Stephen. C. correctly assesses the NT sense of the concept when he says that testimony is "a natural and favourite metaphor...to describe Jesus' knowledge of himself and his disciples' appreciation of his significance." (p. 35). He detects the martyr-meaning only in Heb. 12.1 and I Tim. 2.5 ff. and subscribes to the fallacy, exploded by Kierkegaard, that heroism is the best way to prove the truth of the faith.

K. BARTH (1934) writes of the authority which is given by God to the witness on his being called to testify in the world-trial and avers that the witness can only point to what the prophets have said.

Von CAMPENHAUSEN (1936) distinguishes between the thought of testimony in the Christian sense of preaching the Gospel and Jewish faithfulness and obedience to the Law since the Jews lacked a missionary task (but this was due to their neglect of the testimony of the prophets (JWM)) to make them witnesses. Von C. points out that in the commissioning of the apostles in the Gospels the Holy Spirit is given to encourage speaking, not suffering; he adheres, however, to the view that the μαρτυρία of Mt. 10.18 is a testimony for the prosecution at the Day of Judgement, an interpretation which he would confine to the NT. He takes up Holl's emphasis on the idea of the witness of the resurrection of Christ and regards the authority of the Lucan witnesses of the resurrection as depending on the actual knowledge they have received (Stephen is a witness

because of his vision!) but in the Johannine writings it is a case of the witness testifying not to facts about Jesus but to Christ as the truth. Von C. shares the view that in Revelation *μάρτυς* is used only for the witness who is a martyr, Jesus being the prototype.

SURKAU (1938) perpetuates the view that the *μάρτυς* in Revelation is the martyr but insists that Stephen's discourse has none of the marks of the martyr-speech as in IV Macc. and Mart. Pol. and rightly regards it as proclamation. He admits that the championing of the Law by the Jewish heroes can be expressed as giving testimony for the Law. S. sees the Christian martyrs as testifying the fulfilment in Christ (the second covenant) of the Law (the first covenant) to which the Jewish witnesses bore testimony but he errs in thinking that the *μαρτύριοι* group in the Synoptics has a purely forensic meaning and in objecting to Michel's identifying of prophet and witness.

BARR (1938) demonstrates the interest evinced by the Gospel authors in the factor of eye-witness testimony concerning the words and actions of Jesus and attributes the omission of Romantic and Psychological interest to the need for economy of space. The mention of the names even of minor characters would seem to support the view that the synoptic writers were answering a demand among Christians and opponents for an objective and verifiable presentation of the historical foundation of Christian beliefs. This, however is not quite the same as the testimony of the witness of God.

BURNIER (1939) calls testimony 'the form of the Biblical Revelation' - "on ne peut que témoigner de la Révélation, à cause de son caractère purement existentiel" (p. 41) - and refers to "sa (témoignage) liaison constante avec la notion centrale de Révélation et d'Évangile." Of the testimony of God, B. says that it is the foundation and authority of the apostle. He is at fault, however, in stating: "ce qui fait l'autorité d'un témoignage, c'est la personne de témoin. He sees the object of the testimony as nothing less than the Gospel proclaimed in the person of Jesus and states that the Biblical writings take up towards Jesus the attitude of the witness.

KÄSEMANN (1939, 1951) in (1) sees a distinction between the Johannine writings whose peculiar theme is the 'praesentia Christi' and Luke's 'Konstruktion seiner immanenten Heilsgeschte' - die

Historie Jesu wird von den Aposteln als alleinigen Augenzeugen der Kirche vermittelt und garantiert, die als Heilsanstalt und Hütern dieser Tradition Anteil an der Heilsgeschichte gewährt." (p. 305). For K. the apostles in Luke and the Pastorals are "nicht nur Garanten der kirchlichen Überlieferung sondern zugleich Begründer des kirchlichen Amtes und seiner durch die Ordination vermittelten Sukzession." (p. 306). K. correctly interprets the Johannine phrase 'to have the spirit' as 'to remain under the word in which the exalted Lord speaks to his own' and regards the relationship of the Presbyter to the Tradition as being dialectic - "he has not allowed the Tradition to replace the Holy Spirit and so render the presence of Christ superfluous. The present Christ legitimises the Tradition, not the reverse." K. makes the good point that early Christianity allowed everyone to be a spirit-bearer and grounded authority not on office but on service - he might have added: especially the diakonia of the word.

In (11) Käsemann says that all 'faith-witnesses' are represented only as objects of the divine μαρτυρεῖν. He insists that any continuity in connection with these is that of the divine testimony which "sich stets neue Objekte seiner Konkretisierung schafft." (p. 38). The heroes in Hebrews, he claims, are exceptions to the OT people of God because they turn from the visible-discoverable to the invisible-eschatological word and are prepared to die for it; thus, from being 'testified to', they become 'witnesses' to Christendom by pointing in their homelessness to the divine promise. It would appear that K. is still thinking of the witnesses of Heb. 12.1 as being witnesses because they are prepared to be martyrs.

ASTING (1939) supports emphatically the position that 'testifying' in the scriptures means 'to give expression to a will', in God's case, a revelation and the prophets proclaim this will; they, with the Law are the bearers of the revelation. A. shows that the witnessing activity of the Rabbis is authoritative teaching and his other contribution to the discussion is the insight that it was the leading figures in the Church, the teachers, whom the civil authorities persecuted.

GÜNTHER (1941, 1956) takes up the discussion at this point with the declaration that Astring is too doctrinaire with his constantly repeated 'einem Willen Ausdruck geben'. G. sees testifying as a prophetic activity having as its content revelation which refers especially to the future and that the prophet has a missionary aim. He sees the origin of the Christian μαρτυρ- concept in the late Jewish Apocalyptic of which Jesus,

the true and faithful witness, is the fulfilment. The witnesses are not 'Augenzeugen' but 'Redezeugen' and bearers of the Spirit. G. regards the witness as an office-bearer but says that in Lk. he is necessarily one who has seen the risen Christ and that Stephen must be one of the 'above five hundred brethren'; Paul is included on the grounds of the Damascus vision. G. sees a development from the eye-witness of the fact of the resurrection to that of "die sich auf eine einzigartige Glaubenserkenntnis gründende Überzeuge (I Jn. 5.10)" and maintains that the *μάρτυς* in Rev. 11.3ff. is a combination of the apocalyptic *μάρτυς*, i.e. the bearer of a heavenly message and the martyr in the later sense.

STRATHMANN (1916, 1942, 1960) sees within the Bible an evolution of the meaning of *μάρτυς* from a simple legal or common usage to that of 'martyr'. His main contribution to the debate is his insistence on the difference between witness of fact and witness of a truth which first unite in the Lucan writings: "Tatsachenzeuge und Wahrheitzeuge fallen zusammen - die unvermeidliche Folge davon, dass es sich im Evangelium um eine geschichtliche Offenbarung handelt." Thus, according to S. the idea of the *μάρτυς* gives prominence to the Galilean apostles; in a narrow sense they are qualified because they know the facts of the Cross and the resurrection and have believed their meaning. For Strathmann, Paul is not a fact-witness, in the sense in which the older apostles are, but a truth-witness and from Ac. 22.15 these two ideas run together in the NT. S. sees the *μάρτυς*-expression beginning to change colour martyrologically within the NT in the Johannine writings, in several places in Acts and in the Pastorals.

CERFAUX (1943) adhering to the Roman position, sees a development from the testimony of the Twelve whose content was, "d'abord et avant tout", the resurrection of Jesus and, secondly, his whole life to the missionary preaching of Paul and the other 'heroes' between whom and the Twelve there is an 'essential difference'. The Twelve, for Cerfaux, are, before all, witnesses of the resurrection to the Jews and Paul is the bearer of the Christian message to the Gentiles. C. has difficulty with the title *μάρτυς* as applied to Stephen for he will not allow the primitive sense of 'witness of the resurrection' or the probability of the later sense of 'martyr', he vaguely attributes the use of the word to the reference to "persecutions messianiques" contained in it.

M. BARTH (1946) bases the authority of the Twelve and Paul, whom he calls 'the apostles in the narrow sense', on the fact that they are eye-witnesses of the 'word-become-flesh'; they have seen, heard and touched him and so are witnesses in a primary and authentic way. They are fact-witnesses in addition to being confessing - and martyr-witnesses and it is their being witnesses of the facts of Jesus' earthly life and his resurrection which distinguishes them from and raises them above other witnesses who can present only a partial testimony. According to this definition B. cannot, although he wishes to, include Paul with the Twelve in this category because only if the *μάρτυς* derives his authority from the truth which he 'sees' in the facts could this occur. Barth distinguishes between the witnessing of Stephen and Antipas on the one hand and that of the Apostles on the other on the insufficient grounds that the eye-witness experience of Antipas is not mentioned and that Stephen's vision comes at the end of his ministry and is not an introduction to it.

PREISS (1946) points out that when the question of authority is posed the Reformed Church invokes the interior testimony of the Holy Spirit. He regards nearly all the terminology about the Spirit as being in origin and colour more judicial than mystical or intellectual - "Il est le témoin de Dieu sur la terre dans un vaste procès (p. 20), and he avers that the testimony of the Spirit is not an enthusiasm, a mystic rapture, a possession - "Il fait de la Bible une lettre personnelle." (p.29). "Le témoignage de l'Esprit ne saurait donc rester étranger à notre raison.....l'Esprit enseigne; il est le docteur intérieur des croyants."

FISCHEL (1947) seeks to show that since as early as the first century of the Christian era it had become the generally accepted teaching of Judaism that the prophets had to suffer or even to undergo martyrdom, this is sufficient reason for *μάρτυς* taking on the meaning of 'martyr'.

MORGENTHAUER (1948) presents a persuasive if somewhat over-drawn picture of the Lucan writings as testimony based on the OT requirement of two or three or more witnesses but does not add to the discussion.

PETERSON (1950) lays down that the martyr publishes the public claims of the Church of Christ; the confession of the name of Jesus is an essential part of the martyr-concept and the words are those of the Holy Spirit. Peterson throughout seems

to take the word-group as a whole in the martyrological sense, e.g. on p. 223, note 37 he says that it seems certain that the good confession testified by Jesus (I Tim. 6.13) is the eschatological μαρτύριον which Jesus commissioned his disciples to practice (Mk. 6.11) (!).

RETIF (1951) questions the view of Cerfaux that testimony and kerygma are two different things, preferring to think of them rather as synonymous. He denies that the testimony is confined to the Twelve and that the missionary message is the exclusive prerogative of those who are not apostles. The testimony of the apostles "s'effectuera avant tout par le kerygme" (pp. 156f.). R. makes the useful point that "le mot διαμαρτυρεσθαι, propre à Luc et à Paul, nous apparaît éminemment kérygmatic" (p. 157 with note (16)).

Rétif divides testimony into three categories; historical, juridical and Biblical - "les deux premiers dans la ligne logique de l'esprit grec, le troisième dans la ligne symbolico-ontologique de l'esprit semitique" (p. 157). R. follows Asting in thinking of Biblical testimony as the solemn announcement of a divine will concerning the future. According to this writer the authority of the testimony lies in the fact that it is indeed God who testifies - "le témoignage est envahi et comme absorbé par le témoignage de Dieu même.....Voilà pourquoi le kerygme...ne se fonde pas sur l'autorité ou la crédibilité d'un homme, si sainte ou intelligent fut-il, mais sur l'autorité et la crédibilité de Dieu (cfr. 1 Cor., II, 5; 2 Cor., IV, 7...), lequel ne peut instruire des vérités proprement divines qu'en témoignant.

R. will not have it that all the heralds in Acts are direct witnesses (showing that he still 'glories in the flesh') - "Paul lui-même.....n'a vu que le Christ glorieux."(!). The testimony of the indirect witnesses is "moins riche et moins saisissant que l'expérience du Christ terrestre (cfr. 1 Joan., I, 1). Le témoignage des apôtres avait donc un contenu plus plein que celui des simples hérauts." (pp. 161f.) R. finally expresses the kerygma as "un témoignage 'informé' par une mission."

LODS (1958) sees the confessors and martyrs as successors of the prophets who announce and prepare the coming of the kingdom of God. They are men who speak in the Spirit and die for the sake of their testimony which has "un but apologétique ou missionnaire" (p. 36). He makes the unrealistic statement that

the martyr gives by his testimony "une preuve de la force et de la vérité de la foi chrétienne" (p. 37) but points out importantly that the confessors and martyrs are the successors of the apostles as well as the bishops and that they also carry the responsibility of transmitting the correct faith of the Church.

HASTINGS (1958) reiterates the view that at first μαρτυρίον referred only to the testimony of the Twelve to the Jews in Jerusalem as to the fact of the resurrection of Jesus while the κηρύγμα was the publication of the whole Christian-Jewish message of salvation to the world beyond. "The principle activity of the Apostles is to witness to the Resurrection as proof that Jesus was Messiah. This was destined to produce faith(!) and repentance in believers." (p. 158).

NINEHAM (1958) avers that "At every stage in its history, the early church was in fact interested in eye-witness testimony about the Lord" (p. 14). He associates the μαρτυρία τῆς ἀναστάσεως of Ac. 1.22 with eye-witness testimony although he admits that μαρτυρία has a wider connotation than αὐτόπτης. He notes that "those who chiefly moved about among the Gentile churches were, apart from Paul himself, such as Barnabas and Timothy, Titus and Tychicus, Priscilla, Aquilla and Apollos, none of them eye-witnesses and one at least (Apollos (Acts 18.24ff.)) not very well up in the tradition" (p. 251). But it is not quite correct to say this about Apollos, for Aquilla and Priscilla put him right; up to this point he was simply "an eloquent man and mighty in the scriptures" and it was only after his full instruction in the faith that he became a missionary of the church.

MENOUD (1960) rightly stresses the necessity for witnesses to be able to say: "We have seen" but he gives the impression that seeing the visible and hearing the audible is the decisive aspect. This does not take into account the distinctively Biblical use of the term μαρτυρία. M. later admits that the term means more than a simple eye-witness for he proclaims what he has seen and understood but he claims that "Seuls les apôtres sont les témoins du Christ. Les fidèles ont pour mission d'attester devant le monde, par la vie nouvelle qui les anime, la vérité et l'efficacité du témoignage apostolique (Actes 2:42-47). Car l'Esprit ne crée pas de nouveaux témoins, pas plus du reste qu'il n'a créé les premiers, vu que l'Esprit ne fait pas apparaître le Christ." This leads him into unsatisfactory explanations for the position of Matthias, Paul and Stephen and he does not account for Antipas.

RENGSTORF (1960) rightly opposes Strathmann's notion of the Lucan development of the meaning of $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ from fact-witness to confessing-witness - "Tatsächlich ist der neutestamentliche Gebrauch einheitlich." R., however, incorrectly claims that the NT testimony is the fruit of the days between the resurrection and the ascension of Jesus and distinguishes witness and apostle, the latter receiving his authority from the person of Jesus direct and the former having his ground in the scriptures Christianly interpreted. On this view the authority of Jesus is separated from the authority of the Word and is made to appear to be a different thing. R. shows a real insight into the Biblical meaning of the $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ when he describes him as a scripture expositor - "der $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ auch Ausleger der Heiligen Schriften ist. Er nimmt in seiner $\mu\alpha\epsilon\tau\omega\epsilon\iota\alpha$ Gottes prophetisches Wort auf, sofern es sich in der Geschichte Jesu und zumal in deren Ausgang erfüllt hat." (p. 142) and "Wird der $\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ der Urgemeinde.....zum Urtypus des urchristlichen Theologen" (p. 144).

Additional Note (B)The Organisation of the Early Church.

An admirable survey of the principle Reformed views about the organisation of the Early Church up to 1932 is given by O. Linton in Das Problem der Urkirche in der Neueren Forschung. Linton shows how up to the time of Hatch, Harnack and Sohm there was a Consensus within Protestant research whose main tenets were: (1) The organisation was not originally hierarchical: the episcopoi and presbyteroi were identical. (2) The congregations were autonomous (3) The officials had originally nothing to do with proclamation.

The Consensus was generally of the opinion that the organisation had Jewish origins and the teaching office assumed a modest role without an abiding or organisational meaning.

Hatch's main points (The Organisation of the Early Church) went contrary to the Consensus. He claimed that the development of the constitution of the Church was gradual and he distinguished between episcopoi and presbyteroi. Harnack saw the presbyteroi as officials and the episcopoi as denoting a function; in his controversy with Sohm he found the seeds of the later organisational development already in the New Testament. Harnack, however, was forced by the discovery of the Didache to think of the Church organisation as two-fold, comprising the total church organisation led by charismatics with their teaching-gift and the congregational organisation led by the administrative officials.

Sohm in his Kirchenrecht made the first decisive attack on the prevailing teaching with the thesis that Church and Law stand in opposition to each other and that the church was ruled by the charismatics who were office-bearers of the whole church, with the free consent of the congregations. He regarded even the Eucharist not as an administrative but as a teaching office, and claimed that the episcopate arose when no teacher was available. In the early Church, according to Sohm, there was no congregation in the legal sense, there was no bishop with a right to office; but Church order was inevitable and the turning point is seen by Sohm in I Clem. where the bishop is said to have a right to his office because he has been placed there by his predecessors.

The Catholic view is that the apostle is the one who is authorised by Jesus himself for ruling the Church and who combines in his own person both charismatic and administrative authority. The apostles are a closed group but they pass on their administrative authority to their successors with whom they are distinguished from the 'lesser' charismatics, the prophets, teachers etc. Against this the Consensus held that the apostles had only a moral, personal or spiritual authority, that Jesus appointed the apostles only to serve and preach, not to rule over the church and Lightfoot's contribution: The name and office of an apostle in St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians pp. 92-101 took away all support for the idea that the apostolate was confined to the Twelve.

The next big advance was made by K. Holl in Die Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde. Holl's view is that the apostolate was confined to the Twelve, Paul and James, that the Tradition follows immediately on the tracks of the Charisma and then sets itself over it and that there was a tension between the Jerusalem Church with its emphasis on law and Paul who is less constrained. Holl faults Sohm for drawing his information exclusively from Paul and neglecting other sources (e.g. Acts) but, on the other hand, as Linton points out, Holl keeps Jesus himself in the background.

Linton mentions the two ideas of the Spirit, one 'charismatic' according to which the Spirit is a free, formless principle, the other concrete according to which the Spirit can create order, law etc. and then asks where the early Church stands in relation to this. The present thesis rests on the view (1) that the Spirit of God is not the Spirit of confusion but of order and anything less is a corruption. This is not to deny that the spirit is free and comes and goes as He pleases. Linton falls into the error of confusing the idea of the charismatic and the enthusiast or ecstatic, a conclusion with which Paul would not have agreed as is clear from I Cor. 14.29-33 (although Linton admits that a pneumatic may be an office-bearer "if his temperament is suited" (!) and that Spirit and Tradition are not incompatible opposites).

(2) The Consensus was correct in seeing that the organisation was not originally hierarchical, that the congregations were autonomous and that the organisation had Jewish, certainly OT origins but incorrect in laying so little stress on the

importance of the preaching and teaching authority of the leaders.

(3) Sohm's contribution to the subject of Church organisation is of immense importance and has not been given sufficient prominence; His insistence on the opposition of the early Church organisation and the later officialdom in the church is, unexceptionable and accords well with the concept of *μαρτυρία* and its place in the life of the early Church. Holl's criticism of Sohm is weakened by the fact that, as the present work shows, the evidence of the Gospel and Acts and indeed of the whole Bible points to a charismatic, teaching authority, which may be official or unofficial, within the Church of God.

(4) Holl's view about Tradition and Charisma is based on a false distinction between these two terms; the tradition which is the gospel or testimony of Jesus is a charisma and as such is no dead letter although it has definite principles and boundaries.

Additional Note (C)The Bearing of the *καταβολή* Concept on Bultmann's
Existentialist View of the Historical Jesus and
the Preaching of the Early Church and on Recent
Developments in the Direction of a New Quest of
the Historical Jesus1. Bultmann's View(a) The Salvation-Event

Bultmann is concerned to stress the important fact that the salvation-event of Christian preaching can only be salvation-event for the believer in the existential moment of decision because the Word, according to B. is not just "the natural self-expression of the speaking individual" but implies a relationship between speaker and hearer in which the word becomes an event to the hearer⁽¹⁾ and that it cannot be proved from evidence.⁽²⁾ This idea is repeated in B.'s writings, e.g. "the demand to say once for all and unambiguously what the word of God is must be rejected because it rests on the idea that it is possible to designate a complex of statements that can be found and understood with respect to their 'contents'";⁽³⁾ "I still deny that historical research can ever encounter any traces of the epiphany of God in Christ; all it can do is to confront us with the Jesus of history. Only the Church's proclamation can bring us face to face with Kyrios Christos";⁽⁴⁾ "In the Christian message there is absolutely no question of man's being given an historical account of a section of the

(1) Jesus and the Word, pp. 217f.
 (2) Ib., p. 215.
 (3) Existence and Faith, p. 91.
 (4) Kerygma and Myth, pp. 117f.

past, which he might put to the test, or critically confirm or reject. He is told on the contrary, that in what happened then, whatever the circumstances, God has acted....no science or history can verify this assertion."⁽¹⁾

It is easy to understand Bultmann's desire to emphasise the fact that the event of Jesus Christ has redemptive significance and reality only for the believer in his moment of decision but it is not so easy to understand his dispensing with 'content' and a statement like "In what happened then, whatever the circumstances, God has acted." There can be no 'raw material' about which to decide if there is no content (If Jesus had simply stood before men without doing or saying anything except claiming to be God - B. says Jesus didn't even claim to be present salvation - there would have been no conversions at that time any more than there would be now if Christian preachers were simply to say: "Jesus is Saviour and Lord.") Men will always want to know who this Jesus was and is, what he said and what he did, before they will come to him. One cannot say "whatever the circumstances" for the simple reason that the circumstances of Jesus' life were particular, specified words and events verified by witnesses. It should be made quite clear, however, that what the witnesses verified was not the salvation-event, as Bultmann correctly emphasises, but the events which were interpreted as or "seen" by the disciples to be salvation-events and which they passed on as part of the content of their testimony so that later generations might be confronted by the Jesus who confronted them.

(1) Essays, p. 18.

Bultmann appears to waver between the assertion that revelation has no content and the admission that it does have a content. For example, "If preaching communicates a content, it at the same time addresses us"⁽¹⁾ but it is understood "in its true character only when it is understood as something that takes place in the present, in my particular present."⁽²⁾ It would have been better if B. had written here: "not only.... but also", thus retaining the real paradox of the Christian faith.

(b) The Historical Event

It must be insisted that when Bultmann looks at the historical Jesus as such he sees a real historical person, a phenomenon of the past,⁽³⁾ a Rabbi and wonder-worker; this was the point of his book Jesus and the Word. "I do not deny", writes Bultmann,⁽⁴⁾ that the resurrection kerygma is firmly rooted to the earthly figure of the crucified Jesus" and also "our Salvation is One who is involved in all the relativity of history."⁽⁵⁾

(c) Alternative or Synthesis

One of the principal difficulties in understanding Bultmann's position is that while he is truly concerned with the paradox of the Word become flesh he very often denies the earthly pole of the paradox in order to emphasise the importance of the

(1) Existence and Faith, p. 78.

(2) Ib., pp. 78f.

(3) Kerygma and Myth, p. 117.

(4) Ib., pp. 112f.

(5) Ib., p. 111.

heavenly one. The first thing to note is that he regards redemption as "a historical event wrought out in time and space.....the eschatological emissary of God is a concrete figure of a particular historical past.....a real figure of history.....the word of God is a sober, factual account of a human life, of Jesus of Nazareth, possessing saving efficacy for man."⁽¹⁾ Here are the two aspects of the paradox: 'figure of history' and 'saving efficacy'. Bultmann, however, misleads his readers from time to time by a total denial of the historical pole, e.g. "revelation is not illumination or the communication of knowledge";⁽²⁾ "the fact of salvation (would) be misunderstood if it were thought of as an isolated fact that happened in some place and at some time and that requires to be mediated to the present through a communication";⁽³⁾ while the person and history of Jesus do indeed constitute a pre-supposition of his (Paul's) theology, they do not do so from the point of view of their historical or ideal content, but rather as the act of God, as the occurrence of the revelation of salvation";⁽⁴⁾ "this preaching of God's saving act, however, is not a communication about events that one can also establish outside of faith";⁽⁵⁾ "the salvation-occurrence.....cannot possibly become an event of the past like other historical events" and "the preaching....is neither a narrative report concerning an event of the past that once occurred, nor is it an instruction having to do with questions of world-view,"⁽⁶⁾ "In the Christian

(1) Kerygma and Myth, pp. 43f.

(2) Existence and Faith, p. 78.

(3) Ib., p. 79.

(4) Ib. p. 125.

(5) Ib., p. 139.

(6) Ib., p. 22; cf. Theology of the NT.I, p. 302.

message there is absolutely no question of man's being given an historical account of a section of the past, which he might put to the test, or critically confirm or reject."⁽¹⁾

In fairness to Bultmann it must be stated that in most of the above instances the negative is followed by a "but rather" so what appears to be a blunt negative must be regarded as only a partial one and this is borne out by the fact that in other places he does qualify the negative by a word like 'simply' or 'only', e.g. " (the recollection of the kerygma) does not present us with facts of the past in their bare actuality;"⁽²⁾ "the preaching is itself revelation and does not merely speak about it so that it mediates a content that one can understand;"⁽³⁾ "(the act of God) can never become merely an event in the past that one simply perceives;"⁽⁴⁾ "the church is wrong, so far as the death and resurrection of Jesus are understood merely as given facts of history which may be determined and established by evidence;"⁽⁵⁾ "the figure of Jesus cannot be understood simply from his context in human evolution or history;"⁽⁶⁾ "the cross is not just an event of the past which can be contemplated in detachment."⁽⁷⁾

It must be admitted that Bultmann is right in saying that the saving event is not an historical occurrence. This is true in the same way that water is not oxygen and yet there is no water without there being oxygen. Bultmann's view is also true in the sense that if a man saves another from drowning by

-
- (1) Essays, p. 18.
 (2) Kerygma and Myth, p. 115.
 (3) Existence and Faith, p. 78.
 (4) Ib., p. 78.
 (5) Jesus and the Word, p. 213.
 (6) Kerygma and Myth, p. 35.
 (7) Ib., p. 36.

swimming out to him and bringing him to land no amount of analysis of the action of swimming or description of the swimmer's style will give any real indication of the full meaning of the event for the saved person and yet there would have been no saving had there not been swimming, and swimming of a particular kind. The concept of the *παῖρος* as indicated in the present thesis helps to clarify Bultmann's view. In his passive role the *παῖρος* is an observer of some historical event and in his active role he is a re-presenter and an interpreter of that event in terms of the action of God. It is the interpretation which is given in faith to the observer, it is this faculty of 'seeing' the action of God in the event which reveals the kerygma or *παρθεῖα* as salvation event. In the kerygma the second generation of believers has been confronted both by a re-presentation of the original event and by the disciples' interpretation and so has been brought to the place of decision just as the disciples had been. The historical event of the crucifixion of Jesus becomes salvation-event for the individual when it is interpreted as having occurred for his justification. The testimony of Jesus, the true and faithful witness, was his teaching of the law, his life and death and return and his interpretation of all this in terms of the presence of the Kingdom of God and this became revelation for the disciples when they came to believe. Their memory of the historical events along with their interpretation of them became their testimony which re-presented the historical events, and necessarily so; but the hearer of the disciples' testimony or *παρθεῖα* had to make his own interpretation, that is to say, he had to see the historical event as salvation-event for himself and when this happened the testimony of the disciples became revelation for him. Paul's statement: "The

righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith", (Ro.1. 17) may be expressed as: "The redemptive action of God in Jesus Christ becomes the eschatological occurrence when one who has interpreted the historical events of 1 to 30 A.D. as Jesus and the disciples did, has handed on the account of these events with his interpretation of them and this *παρθεσία* has been accepted in its two aspects, as visible and audible events in time and space and as the interpretation of faith". Merely to accept the testimony as historical event is to deny the existential character of faith; merely to accept the interpretation is to reduce Jesus to a myth. Each hearer must decide for himself whether or not his interpretation of these historical events is to agree with that of Jesus and the disciples.

Bultmann has said⁽¹⁾ "The New Testament speaks of an event through which God has wrought man's redemption. For it, Jesus is not primarily the teacher, who certainly had important things to say, and will always be honoured for saying them, but whose person in the last analysis is immaterial for those who have assimilated his teaching. On the contrary, his person is just what the New Testament proclaims as the decisive event of redemption." But this is unrealistic; there is no question of there being a primary and secondary conception of Jesus; he was the person he was by reason not only of his character and his personal characteristics and the fact of his existence as a man but also by the words he spoke and the acts he did. The fact

(1) Kerygma and Myth, p. 14.

cannot, of course, be disregarded that in his life-time some men were unmoved by Jesus' goodness. The New Testament describes this as blindness towards what the disciples (and also some of Jesus' detractors (Ac. 2.22,41)) later saw. The unbelievers saw what Jesus did but they did not 'see' God's action in Jesus' action; in the same way there are men today who, confronted by the representation of Jesus' words and acts, fail to come to the same conclusion as the disciples. As Jesus was rejected by some in his life-time so today the kerygma is rejected by some.

Bultmann states⁽¹⁾ that the question to be put to the New Testament is: "Which of the following two views determines its idea of revelation, that revelation is the communication of knowledge or that it is an occurrence which puts man in a new situation?" His own answer is that "the demand to say once for all and unambiguously what the word of God is must be rejected because it rests on the idea that it is possible to designate a complex of statements that can be found and understood with respect to their content."⁽²⁾ It is questionable, however, whether this dichotomy is valid in view of the meaning of

μαρτυρία . It would seem that the communicating by believers of knowledge, of certain specified events and sayings which have occurred in the past is the occurrence which puts a man in a new situation, which lets him see the limitations and possibilities in his own life and so opens up the future for him; it was so for Moses and his contemporaries at Sinai; it was so for the prophets and those who believed in their message; it

{¹} Existence and Faith, p. 60.

{²} Existence and Faith, p. 91

was so for the apostles and their converts and it is the conviction of the church that it is still true today for the Christian preacher and those who accept his testimony. Bultmann admits⁽¹⁾ that "one also receives something to know in revelation", and continues: "But such knowledge must surely be a different knowledge than consists in doctrines, which one can accept and preserve, and which only acquire the character of revelation because of the remarkable way in which they have come into one's possession. Indeed, must it not be a knowledge that, just when I know it, is revelation and puts an end to my limitation and makes God present to me?" Most people would of course agree with this if Bultmann would admit that all 'doctrines which one can accept and preserve' are accepted in faith and trust. The Biblical testimony has been shown to have a four-fold content, it is in other words a complex of doctrines which have been accepted and preserved but it is only because they have been accepted and preserved that there is today any proclamation of the word of God, that there is today a re-presentation of Jesus.

(d) The Person, Character and Message of Jesus

Bultmann wrote in Jesus and the Word: "Interest in the personality of Jesus is excluded.....I do indeed think that we can now know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus"⁽²⁾ and in Existence and Faith: "We must frankly confess that the character of Jesus as a human personality cannot be recovered by us."⁽³⁾ These disturbing

(1) Ib., p. 70.

(2) P. 8.

(3) Existence and Faith, p. 52.

statements stem from Bultmann's conviction that Jesus himself was not aware of being the Messiah. It may be true that Jesus did not see himself as the Messiah of popular contemporary Jewish expectation but his life was based on the picture of the servant of God as the fulfilment of the torah which has, in principle the same fourfold content as his own message. Jesus' healing and life-giving actions pointed to him as the fulfilment of the torah in its reference to the creator-God, his recalling of men to the ethical aspects of the torah pointed to him as its fulfilment with reference to God as the giver of the law and his death and resurrection pointed to him as the fulfilment of the torah in its revelation of God as the Redeemer who forgives those who turn to him and gives the promise of eternal blessedness or doom. Bultmann says⁽¹⁾ that "it can be taken for granted that the earliest Church did not ponder over the uniqueness of the place in history and the historical influence of him whose "advent" as Son of Man would presently end all world history" and that the historical phenomenon of Jesus was not thought of in the same way as the great events of the Old Testament, as a decisive event for Israel's history but "neither in the earliest Church nor anywhere in the New Testament is Jesus looked back upon as a deed of God by which - as by Abraham, Moses or David - he showed "mercy" upon the people,.....For Jesus' importance lies not at all in what he did in the past, but entirely in what is expected of him for the future." That this is not altogether the case is shown clearly in the words of

(1) Theology of the NT. I. pp. 35f.

Zacharias in Lk.1.68-79; Jesus is regarded by the New Testament as an event foretold in the past which has come to pass and which can become a present event in the future for those who have eyes to see.

No one would deny that Bultmann is correct when he writes:⁽¹⁾ "no amount of energy and sacrificial courage (and he might have added, or all the virtuous characteristics which the church has through the ages attributed to Jesus, e.g. his humility, his love of children, his concern for the poor and the distraught, his trust in God, his active sympathy, his detestation of hypocrisy and so on) can ever prove anything concerning the truth of the cause which a hero represents," but alongside this truth there must be set the other that these aspects of Jesus' person and personality were part of the event which was Jesus of Nazareth (they are summed up by Peter in his sermon to Cornelius in the words 'went about doing good' and apart from them there was no such person as Jesus of Nazareth. The disciples had more than the simple statements of the kerygma, they had the memory of the Jesus with whom they had lived and learned, the memory of the skandalon, of the man who spoke good words and did good deeds and who claimed that in his own person the kingdom of God was in the midst. It is unthinkable that the apostles preached only the bare outline of the gospel which has been termed the kerygma; certainly, if this was the case the fact that they made converts is more than remarkable. The character and personality of Jesus are not a matter of unconcern; if Jesus had been a thief like the two men who died with him the phenomenon of the kerygma would never have appeared. This is not to deny that there were eye-witnesses of the life and death

(1) Jesus and the Word, p. 216.

of Jesus who chose to believe that he deserved his fate or who were indifferent to it, whereby they made their existential decision.

Bultmann admits that "Little as we know of his (Jesus') life and personality, we know enough of his message to make for ourselves a consistent picture"⁽¹⁾ and even mentions Jesus' 'especial affection for children'.⁽²⁾ The few references in Bultmann's writings to this sort of thing are an indication that for him also it is necessary to know something of the Jesus who lived in Galilee in order to recognise the Lord Jesus Christ of the kerygma. The person and history of Jesus are for Bultmann a pre-supposition of the theology of Paul,⁽³⁾ not from the standpoint of their historical or ideal content, but rather as the act of God, as the occurrence of the revelation of salvation,⁽⁴⁾ yet Paul himself claims that he received from the Lord the tradition concerning the Last Supper and before making that remark Bultmann has just written: "Looked at in terms of the history of ideas, the proclamation of Jesus and that of Paul are essentially the same."⁽⁵⁾

It is in their interpretation of their respective messages that Bultmann sees the difference between Jesus and Paul; he reckons that while Jesus proclaims a final and decisive act of God, the reign of God, as coming, or indeed as now breaking in, Paul affirms that the turn of the aeon has already taken place with the coming, the death and the resurrection of Jesus.⁽⁶⁾

(1) Ib., p. 12.

(2) Ib., p. 61.

(3) Indeed for the whole of the NT according to Bultmann (Theology, I. p. 3).

(4) Existence and Faith, p. 125.

(5) Ib., p. 124.

(6) Kerygma and Myth, pp. 84f.

This idea is repeated in his Theology of the New Testament where he writes: "The earliest Church resumed the teaching of of Jesus, and through its preaching passed it on. So far as it did only that, Jesus was to it a teacher and prophet. But Jesus was more than that to the Church: He was also the Messiah; hence the Church also proclaimed him, himself - and that is the essential thing to see. He who had formerly been the bearer of the message was drawn into it and became its essential content." Schniewind has pointed out that from Bultmann's own book Jesus and the Word "it may be shown how, despite the author's avowed intention, the uniqueness and finality of the here and now of Jesus means the uniqueness and finality of the advent of God".⁽¹⁾ Certainly it is very difficult to see good grounds for this distinction between Jesus as bearer of the Word and Jesus as the Word upon which Bultmann lays much stress; Bultmann, in his chapter on the teaching of Jesus about the Kingdom of God quotes verses from the Synoptics which seem to show quite clearly that to Jesus' mind the Kingdom is a present reality. He quotes Lk. 10.23f. where Jesus says: "Happy are the eyes that see what you see." (pres. tense), Lk. 6.20f. where he says: "Happy are you poor, for yours is (pres. tense) the Kingdom of God, Lk. 10.18f. where Jesus says that he saw Satan fall and that he is now giving the disciples the authority of the servants of the kingdom, Lk. 11.20 where Jesus says to those who deny his claims: "If I by the finger of God cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come (perf. tense) to you", Mk. 3.27 where Jesus implies that he himself has overcome Satan and Mt. 11.5 where he points out that his healing and lifegiving action point to the fact that the long awaited

(1) Kerygma and Myth, pp. 84f.

day of God has arrived.⁽¹⁾ Bultmann defines the Kingdom of God as 'deliverance for men' which 'constrains men to decision';⁽²⁾ this is what Jesus taught and preached, but this is precisely what he saw himself to be and there can be no doubt that he was just as capable of seeing this as was the church which lived on after him and carried on his message.

(e) The Kerygma of the Early Church

Bultmann, with the 'Formgeschichte' school, distinguishes between the proclamation of Jesus and the proclamation of the early church which is not Jesus' proclamation but Jesus himself. He goes so far as to say: "Paul neither heard Jesus' preaching itself, nor did he permit it to be mediated to him by the first disciples, in relation to whom he knew himself to be completely independent (Gal.1:1, 1:11ff.)."⁽³⁾ The first of these statements cannot, in fact, be proved and the second is difficult to reconcile with authentic references by Paul to the tradition which he received (I Cor. 11.23; 15.3). If this is not the tradition of Jesus or his disciples then the question may with justice be asked: "Whose tradition could it possibly be?" Bultmann's theology does not render itself more attractive by the assumptions of the 'Formgeschichte' school of thought which attributes a tremendous spiritual insight to the disciples of Jesus and their successors (an attribute which is certainly not to be found in the Gospels whose picture of the disciples is one of men who only saw the light after Jesus' death) and at the same time credits Jesus himself with no inkling of being

(1) Jesus and the Word, pp. 27f.

(2) Ib., pp. 35,41.

(3) Existence and Faith, p. 123.

the person he really was.

In a very important passage in Kerygma and Myth (pp. 35-38) Bultmann underlines the fact that in its redemptive aspect the cross of Christ is "a permanent historical fact originating in the past historical event which is the crucifixion of Jesus.. . . .the real meaning of the cross is that it has created a new and permanent situation in history. The preaching of the cross as the event of redemption challenges all who hear it to appropriate this significance for themselves." B. then asks: "is this significance to be discerned in the actual event of past history....if we are to perceive the real meaning of the cross, must we understand it as the cross of Jesus as a figure of past history? Must we go back to the Jesus of history?" (pp. 37f.). He concedes that "As far as the first preachers of the gospel are concerned this will certainly be the case. For them the cross was the cross of him with whom they had lived in personal intercourse. The cross was an experience in their own lives. It presented them with a question and it disclosed to them its meaning" (p. 38) but he goes on to admit something which takes away the force of his remarks about the disciples' experience and with it the value of all acts of memory: "but for us this personal connection cannot be reproduced. For us the cross cannot disclose its own meaning: it is an event of the past. We can never recover it as an event in our own lives" (p. 38). There is a grave weakness in Bultmann's position just here because the first preachers of the gospel were as dependent on the reproductions of their memory as people of today are on that same memory of the disciples and therefore on historical research. Bultmann says later (p. 115) that he cannot regard the reproduction of the events of the years 1-30 in memory as the equivalent of the eschatological

encounter but that "it has existential significance only when I make my own particular past present through recollection." This concession to the memory of the subject would appear to detract from the 'present' character of the eschatological moment of existential decision. The disciples and apostles of Jesus were witnesses who included in their testimony their memory of the events of Jesus' life and the words he spoke and also their interpretation of that in terms of redemption. When Peter was preaching in Jerusalem after Pentecost for him also the cross was an event of the past, Jesus was dead and therefore Peter also had to tell the Jews about the Jesus who had gone about doing good, whom they had crucified.

When B. deals with the resurrection of Jesus he avers that it is not an event of past history with a self-evident meaning and suggests that it is the expression of the truth that the death of Jesus deprives death of its power; it is not simply "a miraculous proof capable of demonstration and sufficient to convince the sceptic that the cross really has the cosmic and eschatological significance ascribed to it."⁽¹⁾ "The resurrection is itself an article of faith.....it is the eschatological event"⁽²⁾. It is in this matter of the Resurrection that the meaning of the *πάτερς* as the reminder, the teacher, the expositor of the scriptures comes out most clearly for here there can be no question of a simple witness of fact and this is how Paul can be a witness of the resurrection.

Bultmann is correct in saying that we cannot buttress our faith in the Resurrection by that of the first disciples and so eliminate the element of risk which faith in the Resurrection always involves⁽³⁾ but it is equally correct to say that in the

(1) Kerygma and Myth pp. 38f.

(2) Ib., p. 40.

(3) Ib., p. 42.

Gospels the first disciples present sufficient evidence for us to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God, and that believing we might have life through his name (Jn. 20.31). Something happened in history on the third day; there was an empty tomb, visions were experienced, teaching was imparted. To say that Paul knows nothing of the accounts of the empty grave⁽¹⁾ is unwarrantable; the only legitimate comment about this is that he does not mention these accounts. The disciples have given their testimony and relying on it men today make their existential eschatological decision and so find new life or turn back to the ways of death. If, as Bultmann says, it is certainly the case that the first preachers of the gospel had to go back to the historical Jesus (albeit in their memory) then it is equally the case that the preacher of today has to make every effort to do the same; such an effort, however, will not be made in order to produce a sort of proof for the salvation event but simply in order to provide for faith the same basis in history as that which the disciples themselves had.

2. The New Quest

According to J. M. Robinson⁽²⁾ existentialist philosophy and theology have exposed the impossibility and illegitimacy of the 19th century quest of the historical Jesus, but there has recently been a move by Bultmannians towards what might be termed a new quest. Robinson quotes Bultmann himself as having come to the conclusion that "Jesus' message is after all grace, i.e. 'after all a hidden or secret Christian preaching': such calls for decision as Mt. 11.6; Lk. 12.8f., are, by calling for decision with regard to his person, at the same time words

(1) Theology I., p. 45.

(2) A New Quest of the Historical Jesus.

of promise, of grace: it is at this very moment that the gift of freedom is offered to the hearer."⁽¹⁾ E. Käsemann began the new discussion with the argument that something can be known about the historical Jesus and that the crucial issue is whether there is some kind of continuity between the preaching of the historical Jesus and the Church's kerygma.⁽²⁾ Käsemann was followed by E. Fuchs who stressed that Jesus' conduct was the real context of his preaching and that in Jesus' mouth the parables were 'a witness to himself'. Thus between them Käsemann and Fuchs provide the thesis: "in the message and action of Jesus is implicit an eschatological understanding of his person, which becomes explicit in the kerygma of the primitive Church."⁽³⁾ It is for this reason, no doubt, that there is so much emphasis on the function of the witness in the NT. For Bultmann the classical distinction between Jesus and Paul had been: What for Jesus is future is for Paul past and present. This has become for G. Bornkamm the distinction between John the Baptist and Jesus⁽⁴⁾ and he proceeds to explain that 'the "messianic" aspect of Jesus' being is enclosed in his word and act, and in the unmediatedness of his historical appearance.'⁽⁵⁾ In his Jesus of Nazareth Bornkamm continues to insist that "Paul and the authors of other New Testament writings knew extremely little of the detail which is known to us from the Gospels" and that "The tradition is not really the repetition and transmission of the word he spoke once upon a time, but rather is his word today." (p. 17). He avers that after Jesus'

(1) A New Quest, pp. 20f. Quotation from ZThK, LIV (1957) pp. 246, 254.

(2) A New Quest, pp. 12-14.

(3) Ib., pp. 14-16.

(4) Jesus of Nazareth, pp. 44-52.

(5) Ib. pp. 169-178. "It is the special character of his message and work that Jesus is to be found in his word and in his actions and that he does not make his own rank a special theme of his message prior to everything else." (p. 169).

death "the preacher Jesus of Nazareth enters into the message of faith and himself becomes the content of the preaching; he who called men to believe is now believed in (p. 178; cf. pp. 180-188). He points out, however, that "it cannot be seriously maintained that the Gospels and their tradition do not allow enquiry after the historical Jesus" (pp. 22-26). Bornkamm will not have it that Jesus made the Messianic claim directly but he cannot avoid the statement: "As little as he fulfils the demands of his opponents for proof of his claim, so little does he fulfil the expectations of his followers." But it would seem that his enemies would scarcely have asked for proof had he not made the claim in one way or another.

Jesus' history, according to Bornkamm, is "a movement of broken Messianic hopes" (p. 172) but Jesus' warnings against people being offended at him and his foretelling the coming persecution of his disciples show that he at least had no illusions about his own imminent death.

With regard to the Resurrection Bornkamm states that it is a thing "removed from historical scholarship" and that "it is the message of Easter we must seek in the Easter stories" and "it is.....certain that the appearances of the risen Christ and the word of his witnesses have in the first place given rise to this faith" (p. 183) all of which comes to the same thing as saying that after the death of Jesus something happened which the disciples interpreted as a resurrection. The Emmaus disciples, for example, return to Jerusalem as witnesses because "in the words he (the Risen One) speaks to them and in the supper he eats with them, they have the pledges of his resurrection and presence"(p. 185). The present study of the

Biblical *μαρτυρία* has shown that the continuity goes back beyond Jesus and John the Baptist to Moses and the prophets and the writings of the Old Testament.

Support has been given to the new trend by H. Diem whose basic position is that the New Testament proclaims a Jesus who proclaims himself; Diem advocates a search back to the proclamation of the earthly Jesus.⁽¹⁾ It is agreed by all that unless there is some access to the historical Jesus then the Church's Lord is a myth.

Robinson makes the good point that since the historical Jesus has been shown to confront us with existential decision just as the kerygma does, it is anachronistic to oppose the quest today on the basis of new principles of historiography etc., on the assumption that such a quest is designed to avoid the commitment of faith.⁽²⁾ It is significant that the testimony of Jesus is of the same nature as that of the OT. In both cases the testimony is fundamentally God's testimony; at the time of the Exodus there was no proof that it was God who had acted for the redemption of his people, that it was God who had spoken his word of command and release and promise, just as there was no sign for the people of Jesus' day except the sign of the prophet Jonah. Bultmann's distinction between Jesus the prophet and Rabbi and wonderworker who presented his contemporaries with signs of the time and the Christ of the kerygma of the early Church is not really helped by the reference⁽³⁾ to Mk. 8.11f. on which B. comments: "It is absurd

(1) A New Quest, pp. 22-24.

(2) Ib., p. 77.

(3) Jesus and the Word, p. 30.

and presumptuous to ask him for a specific sign as evidence; his message accredits him." Matthew and Luke, in point of fact, report that Jesus says that a sign will be given, the sign of Jonah who after losing his life had it restored and who, by his consequent kerygma (Mt. 12.41), became a sign to the Ninevites (Lk. 11.30). It would appear that, to Jesus' mind, his death and resurrection are also signs of the times, and are to be given as such.

The testimony of Moses and the prophets, the Baptist, Jesus and the early Church is the evidence of faith which 'sees' in ambiguous events the action and truth, that is, the glory of God and which, in the 'seeing' of these, makes a decision for God, embraces and abandons itself to the Creator, the imperative, the redemption and the promise. The claim that Jesus is the incarnate word, the Son of God, is not made out of a vacuum; it has evidential support but this support is spiritual rather than historical for it rests on prophecy, teaching and actions which may be interpreted in two ways. When all is said and done faith is a sort of calculated risk and the calculation is based on the historical whether it be immediate or mediated. According to the author of Hebrews this was true for Jesus who for the joy set before him endured the cross despising the shame and all the heroes of faith who went before him endured as 'seeing' the invisible. The Christian sees the object of his faith as a certain kind of person; his believing contemporaries saw Jesus as a good man, they saw in the testimony of Jesus' life the uninhibited action of the love which they knew they did not themselves show fully and constantly in their own life; they were aware that Jesus fulfilled God's law of love, that is to say, they were aware of meeting in Jesus the creative life-giving power of God, the irony and wrath of God's

opposition to sin, the forgiving response of God to their own repentance. Jesus' teaching and action combined to form his testimony which he passed on to his disciples that they also might proclaim it in word and deed. This was the nature and source of their authority and it is the nature and the source of the authority which is given by Christ in the kerygma today.

Robinson says with justice: "The current limitation of New Testament research to the kerygma has a significant formal deficiency: it sees Jesus only in terms determined by the Christian encounter."⁽¹⁾ This deficiency may be made up to some extent by the introduction of the *παρουσία* concept which includes the idea of encounter, that between teacher and taught, preacher and congregation, and also, importantly, introduces the idea of the concreteness of the teacher's experience. Thus the recognition of the existence and importance of the NT witness must be one of the primary factors in any new quest. Robinson states that there is in the Gospels sufficient material whose historicity tends to be generally accepted, to make a historical encounter with Jesus possible⁽²⁾ and makes the important point that "if it is true that the kerygma of the primitive Christians can become contemporaneous with me in my concrete historical encounters, then, in principle at least, this is equally true of the historical Jesus."⁽³⁾

Robinson's conclusion is that "the deeper meaning of Jesus' message....is constitutive of his selfhood, expresses itself in his action, and is finally codified in the Church's kerygma."⁽⁴⁾

(1) *A New Quest*, p. 86.

(2) *Ib.* pp. 104f. See also pp. 120-125 for a demonstration of the underlying unity of the message of Jesus and the kerygma of the early Church.

(3) *Ib.*, p. 106.

(4) *Ib.* p. 123.

and that "Paul's transcendent existence is one with the selfhood of Jesus proclaimed in the kerygma.....the selfhood of Jesus is equally available to us - apparently both via historical research and via the kerygma - as a possible understanding of our existence."⁽¹⁾

In Mt. 10 both action (vv. 1,8,14; cf. Mk. 6.11) and kerygma (vv. 7,19f.,27) are spoken of as μαρτύριον, the gift of the Holy Spirit, that is, the testimony of God. The OT μαρτυρία are also the testimonies of God. The μαρτύριον of the Lord of which Paul warns Timothy not to be ashamed is the testimony of Christ which is also the testimony of God (II Tim. 1.8; I Cor. 1.6; 2.1). In Mt. 24.14 the μαρτύριον is the gospel of the kingdom which is to be a kerygma throughout the whole world. If this verse is not a saying of Jesus but is put into his mouth by the early Church it is curious that the Church should meanwhile be engaged in preaching the kerygma of the death and resurrection, unless it had already identified the gospel of the kingdom which Jesus preached and its own proclamation. The factor of testimony in the New Testament shows the real possibility of a new quest of the historical Jesus for the New Testament witnesses present eye-witness evidence of historical facts out of their own experience along with an interpretation of these which presents them as the salvation-event.

⁽¹⁾ Ib. p. 125.

BIBLIOGRAPHY(1) Works Directly Concerned with the Subject of Testimony

- P. Allard. Ten Lectures on the Martyrs. (1907).
- R. Asting. Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum. (1939), esp. pages 458-749.
- A. Barr. The Factor of Testimony in the Gospels, in The Expository Times. XLIX 9(1938) pp. 401-408.
- K. Barth. Der Christ als Zeuge.
Theologische Existenz Heute. 12(1934).
- M. Barth. Der Augenzeuge. (1946).
- J. H. Bernard. The Idea of "Witness" in The Gospel according to St. John. (I.C.C.). I. (1958), pp. xc - xciii.
- E. Burnier. La Notion de Témoignage dans le Nouveau Testament. (1939).
- H. F. von Campenhausen. Die Idee des Märtyriums in der alten Kirche. (1936).
- R. P. Casey. Article on μαρτυρος, in The Beginnings of Christianity. (edd. Jackson and Lake) I. (1933) pp. 30-37.
- L. Cerfaux. Témoins du Christ d'après le Livre des Actes in Angelicum. XX. (1943) pp. 166-183 and in Recueil Lucien Cerfaux. II. (1954). pp. 157-174.
- P. Corssen. (i) Begriff und Wesen des Märtyrers in der Alten Kirche in Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum. 35 (1915). pp. 481-501.
(ii) ΜΑΡΤΥΣ und ΠΣΕΥΔΟΜΑΡΤΥΣ in Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum. 37 (1916). pp. 424-427.
- H. Delehaye. Sanctus in Subsidia Hagiographa 17 (1927). pp. 74-121.

- H. Diem. Das Bekenntnis in der Kirche des Neuen Testaments in Evangelische Theologie 1 (1934/35). pp. 420-442.
- F. Dornseiff. Der Märtyrer: Name und Bewertung in Archiv für Religionswissenschaft. 22 (1923/25). pp. 133-139.
- H. A. Fischel. Martyr and Prophet in The Jewish Quarterly Review. 37.3(1947). pp. 265-280.
- G. Fitzer. Der Begriff des Märtyrers in Judentum und Urchristentum. (1928).
- F. W. Gass. Das christliche Märtyrerthum in der ersten Jahrhunderten in Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie. 3(1859). pp. 323-332.
- J. Geffken. Die Christlichen Martyrien in Hermes. 45(1910). pp. 481-505.
- E. Gunther. (i) Märtyrus . die Geschichte eines Wortes. (1941).
(ii) Zeuge und Märtyrer in Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 47 (1956). pp. 145-161.
- A. von Harnack. Das ursprüngliche Motiv der Abfassung vom Märtyrer - und Heiligungs-akten in der Kirche in Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (1910). pp. 106-125.
- A. Hastings. Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem. (1958).
- K. Holl. (i) Die Vorstellung vom Märtyrer und die Märtyrerakte in ihrer geschichtliche Entwicklung in Neue Jahrbücher für die klassische Altertum. 33 (1914). pp. 521-556. and in Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte II. (1928) pp. 68-102.

K. Holl.

(ii) Der ursprüngliche Sinn des Namens Märtyrer in Neue Jahrbücher für die klassische Altertum. 37 (1916). pp. 252-259 and in Gesammelte Aufsätze II. (1928). pp. 103-109.

(iii) ΨΕΥΔΟΜΑΡΤΥΣ in Hermes. 52 (1917). pp. 301-307. and in Gesammelte Aufsätze. II. (1928). pp. 110-114.

(iv) Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde. in Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie (1921). pp. 920-947 and in Gesammelte Aufsätze II. (1928). pp. 44-57.

E. C. Hoskyns.

The Authority of the Fourth Gospel in The Fourth Gospel (1942). pp. 93-104.

E. Kasemann.

(i) Die göttliche μαρτυρία als Kontinuität der Heilsgeschichte in Das wandernde Gottesvolk. (1939). pp. 37-39.

(ii) Ketzer und Zeuge in Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche. 48 (1951). pp. 292-311.

F. Kattenbusch.

Der Märtyrertitel in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 4 (1903). pp. 111-127.

G. Krüger.

Zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Märtyrertitels in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 17 (1916). pp. 264-269.

L. Laberthonnière.

Le Témoignage des Martyrs in Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne. 3(1906/07). pp. 60-90.

P. de Labriolle.

Martyr et Confesseur in Bulletin d'Ancienne Littérature et d'Archaeologie Chrétiennes,

K. Latte.

Martyria in Pauly. Real-Encyclopädie 14.2(1930). 2032ff.

- H. Lietzmann. Martys in Pauly. Real-Encyclopädie 14. 2(1930). 2044ff.
- M. Lods. Confesseurs et Martyrs. (1958). pp. 7-17.
- E. Lohmeyer. Die Idee des Märtyrismus in Judentum und Urchristentum in Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie. 5(1927). pp. 232-249.
- T. W. Manson. Martyrs and Martyrdom. (1957).
- Ph-H Menoud. Jésus et ses témoins in Eglise et Théologie. 68 (1960). pp. 7-20.
- O. Michel. (i) Prophet und Märtyrer. (1932).
(ii) Biblisches Bekennen und Bezeugen in Evangelische Theologie. 2(1935). pp. 231-245.
- R. Morgenthaller. Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis. II (1948).
- W. Mundle. Die Stephanusrede Apg 7: eine Märtyrerapologie in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 20(1921). pp. 133-147.
- J. Munck. Petrus und Paulus in der Offenbarung Johannis. (1950). esp. pp. 1-46.
- D. E. Nineham. Eye-witness Testimony and the Gospel Tradition in Journal of Theological Studies. 9(1958). pp. 13-25; 243-252.
- H. Obendiek. Das gute Bekenntnis nach I Tim. 6.11-16 in Evangelische Theologie. Nov/Dec (1946). pp. 234-257.
- J. R. van Peet. Article on Witness in Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. (ed. J. Hastings) II. (1908). pp. 830-832.
- E. Peterson. Zeuge der Wahrheit in Theologische Traktate. (1950). pp. 167-224.
- T. Preiss. Le Témoignage intérieur du Saint-Esprit. (Cahiers Théologiques de l'Actualité Protestante. No. 13) (1946).

- R. Reitzenstein. der Titel Märtyrer in Hermes. 52 (1917). pp. 442-452.
- K. H. Rengstorff. (i) Apostelamt und Predigtamt. (1954).
(ii) Zum Begriff des Zeugen im Osterkerygma in Die Auferstehung Jesu. (1960). pp. 136-145.
- A. Rétif. Témoignage et Prédication Missionnaire dans les Actes des Apôtres in Nouvelle Revue Théologique. LXXIII(1951). pp. 152-165.
- D. W. Riddle. (i) Die Verfolgungslogien in formgeschichtlicher und sozialogischer Beleuchtung in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 4(1934). pp. 271-289.
(ii) The Martyr Motif in the Gospel according to St. Mark in The Journal of Religion. IV(1924). pp. 397-410.
- A. Schlatter. Der Märtyrer in den Anfängen der Kirche in Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. 19(1915). pp. 225-310.
- E. Stauffer. Märtyrertheologie und Täuferbewegung in Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte. 4(1933). pp. 545-598.
- H. Strathmann. (i) Der Märtyrer. Ein Bericht über neue Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Wortes und der Ausschauung in Theologisches Litteraturblatt. 37 (1916). pp. 337- 343; 353-356.
(ii) Article on μάρτυς in Kittel: Wörterbuch. IV.(1942). pp. 477-520.
(iii) Die Entstehung und der Wortlaut des Neuen Testaments in Neue Testament Deutsch I. (1960) pp.1-35. esp. pp. 5-18.

H. W. Surkau.

Martyrien in jüdischer und frühchristlicher Zeit. (1938).

F. Torm.

Die Psychologie des vierten Evangeliums: Augenzeuge oder nicht? in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 30 (1931). pp. 124-144.

C. H. Turner.

I Tim. vi. 12.13. ΕΠΙ ΠΟΝΤΙΟΥ ΠΑΡΑΙΟΥ in Journal of Theological Studies. XXVIII.3.(1927). pp. 270-273.

M. Viller.

(i) Les Martyres et L'Esprit in Recherches de Science Religieuse. 14 (1924). pp. 544-551.

(ii) Martyre et Perfection in Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique. (1925). pp. 3-25.

(2) General

P. Althaus.

The So-called Kerygma. (1959).

K. Barth.

Church Dogmatics. Vol. I. Part. I. (1936). pp. 51-135.

H. W. Bartsch.

Kerygma and Myth. (1953).

J. Behm.

Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum. (1911).

E. Best.

Article on πρεσβύτερος in Kittel: Wörterbuch. V. (1954). pp. 798-812.Prophets and Preachers in Scottish Journal of Theology 12 (1959). pp. 129-150.

H. W. Beyer.

Article on διακονέω in Kittel: Wörterbuch. II. (1935). pp. 81-93.Article on κυβερνέω in Kittel: Wörterbuch. III. (1938). pp. 1034-1036.

H. Bietenhard.

Article on κατηχέω in Kittel: Wörterbuch. III. (1938). pp. 638-640.

M. Black.

Article on ὄνομα in Kittel: Wörterbuch. V. (1954). pp. 242-283.

R. J. Bonner and

The Scrolls and Christian Origins. (1961).

G. Smith.

The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle. (1930).

G. Bornkamm.

Article on μυστήριον in Kittel: Wörterbuch. IV. (1942). pp. 809-834.

D. Bosch.

Article on Περίσβυς in Kittel: Wörterbuch. VI. (1959). pp. 651-672.Jesus of Nazareth. (1960).

B. H. Branscomb.

Die Heidenmission in der Zukunftschau Jesu. (1959).Jesus and the Law of Moses. (1930).

- H. Braun. Zur Terminologie der Acta von der Auferstehung Jesu in Theologische Literaturzeitung. 77 (1952). pp. 533-536.
- W. H. Brownlee. The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline in Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research. Supplementary Studies. 10-12 (1951).
- F. Bucheler und E. Zitelmann. Das Recht von Gortyn in Rheinisches Museum für Philologie (Ergänzungsheft). Band 40. (1885).
- F. Büchsel. Article on ἰσχυρὸς in Kittel: Wörterbuch. II. (1935). pp. 168-175.
- R. Bultmann. Jesus and the Word. (1935). New Testament and Mythology. A Reply to the Theses of J. Schniewind and Bultmann Replies to his Critics in Kerygma and Myth. ed. H. W. Bartsch. (1953). Essays. (1955). Theology of the New Testament. I. (1956) and II. (1958). Existence and Faith. (1961).
- H. F. von Campenhausen. Der Urchristliche Apostelbegriff in Studia Theologica. (Lund). I and II. (1947/48). pp. 96-130. Kirchliches Amt und Geistliche Vollmacht. (1953). esp. pp. 1-162; 323-332.
- P. Carrington. The Primitive Christian Catechism. (1940).
- M. Cross (Jnr.). The Ancient Library of Qumran. (1958).
- O. Cullmann. The Tradition in the Early Church. (1956). pp. 59-99. The Christology of the New Testament (1959).
- N. A. Dahl. Anamnesis in Studia Theologica. (Lund). I and II. (1947/48). pp. 69-95.

J. Daniélou.

La Communauté de Qumrân et l'organisation de l'Eglise ancienne in Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses. XXV(1955). pp. 104-115.

The New Testament and the Theology of History in Texte und Untersuchungen. (1959). pp. 25-34.

D. Daube.

ἐξουσία in Mk. 1.22.27 in The Journal of Theological Studies. XXXIX (1938). pp. 45-59.

The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. (1956).

W. D. Davies.

Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. (1948).

C. Delling.

Article on Παράκλησις in Kittel: Wörterbuch. IV. (1942). pp. 11-15.

J. Denney.

The Authority of Christ in Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. ed. J. Hastings. I. (1906). pp. 146-152.

M. Dibelius.

From Tradition to Gospel. (1934).

E. von Dobschütz.

Die Kirche im Christentum in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 28 (1929). pp. 107-118.

C. H. Dodd.

Jesus as Teacher and Prophet in Mysterium Christi. edd. G.K.A. Bell and A. Deissmann. (1930). pp. 59-66.

The Apostolic Preaching. (1936)

History and the Gospel. (1938).

The Authority of the Bible. (1948)

The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. (1953).

The Appearances of the Risen Christ in Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. ed.

D. E. Nineham. (1955.)

A. Dupont-Sommer.

Le Quatrième Livre des Machabées. (1939).

The Essene Writings from Qumran. (1961).

- A. Edersheim. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. I. (1900).
- E. Fascher. ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ. (1927).
- F. V. Filson. The Significance of the Early House Churches in The Journal of Biblical Literature. LVIII (1939). pp. 105-112.
- W. Foerster. The Christian Teacher in the First Century in The Journal of Biblical Literature. LX (1941). pp. 317-328.
- Article on ἡγεστίν in Kittel: Wörterbuch. II. (1935). pp. 557-572.
- Die δοκοῦντες in Gal. 2 in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 36 (1937). pp. 286-292.
- A. Fridrichsen. Jesus, St. John and St. Paul in The Root of the Vine. ed. A. Fridrichsen. (1953). pp. 37-62.
- G. Friedrich. Article on κέρυξ in Kittel: Wörterbuch. III. (1938). pp. 682-717.
- Article on προφήτης in Kittel: Wörterbuch. VI. (1959). pp. 829-858.
- Article on εὐαγγελιστοί in Kittel: Wörterbuch. II. (1935). pp. 705-735.
- T. H. Gaster. The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect. (1957).
- B. Gerhardsson. Memory and Manuscript. (1961).
- R. G. Glazebrook. Studies in the Book of Isaiah. (1910).
- O. Glombitza. Die Titel Διδάσκαλος und Ἐπιστάτης für Jesus bei Lukas in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 49 (1958). pp. 275-278.
- M. Goguel. L'Eglise Primitive. (1947).
- Les Premiers Temps de L'Eglise. (1949).
- M. D. Goulder and M. L. Sanderson. St. Luke's Genesis in The Journal of Biblical Studies. 8 (1957). pp. 12-30.
- F. C. Grant. The Gospels. (1957).

- H. Greeven. Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 44 (1952/53). pp. 1-43.
- W. Grundmann. Article on ἀποστολὴ in Kittel: Wörterbuch. II. (1935). pp. 286-318.
Die Apostel zwischen Jerusalem und Antioch in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 39 (1940). pp. 110-137.
- A. von Harnack. On the Origin of the Christian Ministry in The Expositor. Ser. 3. Vol. 5. (1887) pp. 321-343.
The History of Dogma. (1897).
The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. (1904).
The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries. (1910).
Das "Wir" in den Johanneischen Schriften in Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil. Hist. Klasse. (1923). pp. 96-113.
κόπος (κοπῆαι, οἱ κοπιῶντες) in frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 27 (1928). pp. 1-10.
- E. Hatch. The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches. (1909).
- F. Hauck. Article on κόπος . κοπιῶω in Kittel: Wörterbuch. III. (1938). pp. 827-829.
- J. W. Headlam. The Procedure of the Gortynian Inscription in The Journal of Hellenic Studies. XIII (1893). pp. 48-69.
- F. J. A. Hort. The Christian Ecclesia. (1898).
- E. C. Hoskyns. Jesus the Messiah in Mysterium Christi edd. G. K. A. Bell and A. Deissmann. (1930). pp. 69-89.
- J. Jeremias. Article on Πολιτεία in Kittel: Wörterbuch. VI. (1959). pp. 484-501.

- J. W. Jones. The Law and Legal Theory of the Greeks. (1936).
- S. Kierkegaard. Of the Difference between a Genius and an Apostle in The Present Age. (1940).
- K. E. Kirk. The Apostolic Ministry (1946).
- G. Kittel. The Jesus of History in *Mysterium Christi*. edd. G. K. A. Bell and A. Deissmann. (1930). pp. 31-49.
- Article on ἀγῶν in Kittel: Wörterbuch. IV. (1942). pp. 100-145.
- K. Kohler. The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church. (1929).
- K. Lake. The Twelve and the Apostles in The Beginnings of Christianity. edd. Jackson and Lake. I. (1933). pp. 37-59.
- G. W. H. Lampe. The Seal of the Spirit. (1951).
- K. Latte. Heiliges Recht. (1920).
- O. Lindton. Nicht Über das hinaus, was geschrieben steht. (I. Cor. 4.6) in Theologische Studien und Kritiken. 102 (1930). pp. 425-437.
- J. Line. The Doctrine of the Christian Ministry. (1959).
- O. Linton. Das Problem der Urkirche in der Neueren Forschung. (1932).
- W. Lowrie. The Church and its Organisation in Primitive and Catholic Times. (1904).
- J. Mackay. God's Order. (1953)
- A. J. Mason. The Conception of the Church in Early Times in Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry. ed. H.B. Swete. (1918), pp. 1-56.
- W. Michaelis. Article on ὁράω in Kittel: Wörterbuch. V. (1954). pp. 315-381.
- O. Michel. Article on μικροσκοπία in Kittel: Wörterbuch. IV. (1942). pp. 678-687.
- Article on οἰκονομος in Kittel: Wörterbuch. V. (1954). pp. 151-155.
- Article on δομολογέω in Kittel: Wörterbuch. V. (1954). pp. 199-220.

- G. Miegge. Gospel and Myth. (1960).
- G. F. Moore. Judaism, I. (1927).
- J. Morgenstern. The Ark, the Ephod and the Tent of Meeting. (1945).
- S. Mowinckel. Die Vorstellung des Spätjudentums vom hl. Geist als Fürsprecher und der johanneische Paraklet in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 32 (1933). pp. 97-130.
- J. Munck. La Vocation de l'Apôtre Paul in Studia Theologica. (Lund). I. and II. (1947/48). pp. 131-145.
- Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. (1959).
- W. Mundle. Das Kirchenbewusstsein der ältesten Christenheit in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 22 (1923). pp. 20-42.
- W. Nauck. Probleme des frühchristlichen Amtsverständnisses in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 48 (1957). pp. 200-220.
- A. Oepke. Article on καλύπτω in Kittel: Wörterbuch. III. (1938) pp. 558-597. esp. pp. 565ff.
- G. Östborn. Tora in the Old Testament. (1945).
- E. Pfeiffer. Das Charisma und das geistliche Amt in ihrem Unterschiede und in ihrem Verhältnis zu einander in Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben. 4. 47/48. (1853). pp. 378-387.
- J. K. S. Reid. The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry. (1955).
- R. Rendtorf. Article on προφητης in Kittel: Wörterbuch. VI. (1959). pp. 796-813.
- K. H. Rengstorff. Article on διδάσκω in Kittel: Wörterbuch. II. (1935). pp. 138-168.

- K. H. Rengstorff. Article on μαρθάνω in Kittel: Wörterbuch. IV. (1942). pp. 392-465.
Apostleship. (1952).
- H. Riesenfeld. La voie de charité in Studia Theologica (Lund). I. and II. (1947/48). pp. 146-157.
The Ministry in the New Testament in The Root of the Vine, ed. A. Fridrichsen. (1953). pp. 96-127.
The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings. (1957).
- J. A. Robinson. The Christian Ministry in the Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic Periods. in Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry, ed. H. B. Swete. (1918). pp. 57-92.
- J. M. Robinson. A New Quest of the Historical Jesus. (1959).
- H.W. Robinson. The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit. (1928).
- J. M. Ropes. Bemerkungen zu der Rede des Stephanus und der Vision des Petrus. in Theologische Studien und Kritiken. 102 (1930). pp. 307-315.
- M. Rostovtzeff. The Excavations at Deuro-Europos. 6 (1936).
- A. Sabatier. The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit. (1904).
- G. Sass. Apostelamt und Kirche. (1939).
zur Bedeutung von δαδλός bei Paulus in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. 40 (1941). pp. 24-32.
- H. Sasse. Jesus Christ the Lord in Mysterium Christi. edd. G. K. A. Bell and A. Deissmann. (1930). pp. 93-120.
- S. Schechter. Studies in Judaism. (1896).
Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. (1909).

- A. Schlatter. The Church in the New Testament Period. (1955).
- H. Schlier. Article on παρενσία in Kittel: Wörterbuch. V. (1954). pp. 869-884.
- O. Schmitz. Article on παραγγέλλω in Kittel: Wörterbuch. V. (1954). pp. 759-762.
- Article on παρακαλέω in Kittel: Wörterbuch. V. (1954). pp. 771-798.
- J. Schniewind. Article on ἀγγελία in Kittel: Wörterbuch. I. (1933). pp. 56-71.
- E. Schweizer. Church Order in the New Testament. (1961).
- I. L. Seeligman. The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. (1948).
- E. G. Selwyn. The Authority of Christ in the New Testament in New Testament Studies. III. (1956/57) pp. 83-92.
- R. Sohm. Kirchenrecht. (1892). esp. pp. 1-156.
- G. Stählin. Article on πύθος in Kittel: Wörterbuch. IV. (1942). pp. 769-803.
- Article on παραμυθεῖν in Kittel: Wörterbuch. V. (1954). pp. 815-822.
- E. Stauffer. Jüdisches Erbe im urchristlichen Kirchenrecht in Theologische Literaturzeitung. 77 (1952). pp. 201-206.
- K. Stendahl (ed.). The Scrolls and the New Testament (1958).
- H. Strathmann. Article on λατρεύειν in Kittel: Wörterbuch. IV. (1942). pp. 221-238.
- B. H. Streeter. The Primitive Church. (1929).
- H. B. Swete. The Holy Spirit in the New Testament. (1909).
- M. N. Tod. International Arbitration among the Greeks. (1913).

- T. F. Torrance. Conflict and Agreement in the Church.
II. (1960). pp. 1-92.
- R. C. Trench. Synonyms of the New Testament (1901).
- G. Vermès. Les Manuscrits du Désert de Juda.
(1954).
- P. Wernberg-Møller. The Manual of Discipline. (1957).
- W. Zimmerli. Article on παῖς Θεοῦ in Kittel:
Wörterbuch. V. (1954). pp. 653-676.
- T. Zahn. Introduction to the New Testament.
Vol. I. II and III. (1909).

(3) Commentaries.

- T. K. Abbott. The Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians. (1897).
- W. F. Adeney. Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther. (1893).
- W. C. Allen. The Gospel according to St. Matthew. (1907).
- E. B. Allo. Première Epître aux Corinthiens. (1956).
- K. Barth. The Resurrection of the Dead. (1933).
The Epistles to the Romans. (1933).
- J. H. Bernard. The Gospel according to St. John. I and II. (1928).
- H. W. Beyer. Die Apostelgeschichte. (1959).
- C. Bigg. The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. (1901).
- A. E. Brooke. The Johannine Epistles. (1912).
- F. F. Bruce. The Acts of the Apostles. (1956).
- C. F. Burney. Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings. (1903).
- E. de W. Burton. The Epistle to the Galatians. (1921).
- H. J. Cadbury. Commentary on the Preface of Luke in The Beginnings of Christianity. edd. F. J. F. Jackson and K. Lake. Part I. Vol. I (1922). pp. 489-510.
- J. Calvin. Commentary on Isaiah. (1852).
The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. (1960).
- R. H. Charles. The Revelation of St. John. I. and II. (1920).
- C. E. B. Cranfield. The First Epistle of Peter. (1950).
- F. Delitzsch. Commentary on the Psalms. I. II. and III. (1887-1889).
- J. Denney. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. (1894).
- M. Dibelius. Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus an Timotheus I. II. (1913).

- E. von Dobschütz. Die Thessalonicher-Briefe. (1909).
 C. H. Dodd. The Johannine Epistles. (1946).
 B. S. Easton. The Pastoral Epistles. (1948).
 K. Galling. Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemia. (1954).
 B. Gemsel. Sprüche Salomos. (1937).
 H. L. Goudge. First Corinthians. (1903).
 E. P. Gould. The Gospel according to St. Mark. (1896).
 H. Gunkel. Die Psalmen. (1926).
 R. Bultmann. Das Evangelium des Johannes. (1950).
 E. Haenchen. Die Apostelgeschichte. (1959).
 W. R. Harper. Amos and Hosea. (1936).
 J.R. Harris and A. Mingana. The Odes and Psalms of Solomon. (1920).
 F. J. A. Hort. The First Epistle of St. Peter. (i.1 - ii.17). (1898).
 E. C. Hoskyns. The Fourth Gospel. I. and II. (1942).
 C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch. Joshua, Judges and Ruth. (1869).
 C. F. Keil. The Books of the Kings. (1872).
 A. F. Kirkpatrick. The Book of Psalms. (1902).
 E. König. Das Deuteronomium. (1917).
 H. J. Kraus. Klagelieder. (1956).
Psalmen. I. and II. (1960).
 K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury. Commentary on Acts in The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. Vol. IV. (1933), edd. F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake.
 M.-J. Lagrange. Evangelie selon Saint Matthieu. (1923).
 A. R. C. Leaney. A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke. (1958).
The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon. (1960).

- J. B. Lightfoot. St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. (1878).
St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon. (1892).
Notes on Epistles of St. Paul. (1895)
St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. (1896).
St. John's Gospel. (1956).
- E. Lohmeyer. Das Evangelium des Markus. (1937).
Die Offenbarung des Johannes. (1953).
Der Brief an der Hebraer. (1936).
- O. Michel. The Epistle to the Hebrews. (1924).
- J. Moffatt. The General Epistles. (1928).
- M. Noth. Das Buch Joshua. (1938).
Das zweite Buch Mose. (1959).
Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde.
Bemerkungen zu Apg. 1-7. (1957).
- B. Reicke. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. (1952).
- K. H. Rengstorf. Les Epîtres aux Thessaloniens. (1956).
- B. Rigaux. The Epistle of St. James. (1916).
- J. H. Ropes. Chronikbücher. (1955).
- W. Rudolph. The Epistle to the Romans. (1895).
- W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam. Die Kirche der Griechen. (1936).
Der Evangelist Matthäus. (1948).
- A. Schlatter. Das Evangelium nach Markus. (1950).
Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. (1954).
- J. Schmidt. The Pastoral Epistles. (1936).
- J. Schniewind. The First Epistle of St. Peter. (1961).
- E. F. Scott. The Book of Isaiah, I. and II. (1910).
- E. G. Selwyn. Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel. (1912).
- G. A. Smith. Les Epîtres Pastorales. (1947).
- J. M. P. Smith, W. H. Ward and J. A. Bewer. L'Épître aux Hébreux. (1952).
- C. Spicq.

H. L. Strack and
P. Billerbeck.

Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
aus Talmud und Midrasch. I. - III.
(1922, 1924, 1926).

H. B. Swete.

The Apocalypse of St. John. (1906).
The Gospel according to St. Mark.
(1913).

C. H. Toy.

The Book of Proverbs. (1899).

M. R. Vincent.

The Epistles to the Philippians and
Philemon. (1897).

P. Volz.

Der Prophet Jeremia. (1928).

Jesaia, II. (1932).

J. W. C. Wand.

The General Epistles of St. Peter
and St. Jude. (1934).

A. Weiser.

Die Prophetie des Amos. (1929).

Die Propheten, Hosea, Joel, Amos,
Obadja, Jona, Micha. (1949).

Der Prophet Jeremia. (1952).

B. Weiss.

Die drei Briefe des Apostel Johannes.
(1899).

J. Weiss.

Der erste Korintherbrief. (1910).

B. F. Westcott.

The Epistles of St. John. (1905).

The Epistle to the Hebrews. (1892).

(4) Books of Reference.

- W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. (1957).
- A. Boeckhius. Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum. I. (1828).
- F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. (1906).
- E. W. Bullinger. A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament. (1886).
- R. H. Charles. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. (1913).
- G. Curtius. Principles of Greek Etymology. I. (1886).
- H. Danby. The Mishnah. (1933).
- W. Dittenberg. Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum. (1920).
- Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History. I. (1926) and II. (1932). (Loeb Edition).
- F. Field. Origenis Hexaplorum. I. and II. (1875).
- W. Gesenius. Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. (1857).
- B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. (1898ff.).
- The Amherst Papyri. (1900 ff.).
- Greek Papyri, Series. II. (1897).
- A. M. Habermann. Megilloth Midbar Yehuda. (the Scrolls from the Judean Desert). (1959).
- E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath. Concordance to the Septuagint. (1897).
- M. R. James. The Apocryphal New Testament. (1924).
- G. Kaibel. Epigrammata Graeca. (1878).
- E. Kautzsch. Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments. (1900).
- F. G. Kenyon. Greek Papyri in the British Museum. (1893. ff.).

- K. Lake. The Apostolic Fathers. I. and II. (1959).
- B. Latyshev. Inscriptiones Antiquae Orae Septentrionalis Ponti Euxini Graecae et Latinae. (1885).
- H. Liddell and R. Scott. Greek-English Lexicon. (1940).
- L. Mitteis und U. Wilcken. Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde. (1912).
- J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament. (1915. ff.).
- E. Nestle. ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΑ ΛΟΓΙΑ (British and Foreign Bible Society, 1958).
- W. Pape. Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch. (1857).
- F. Passow. Wörterbuch der Griechischen Sprache. (1852-1857).
- F. Preisigke. Griechische Papyrus zu Strassburg. (1912-1920).
- A. Rahlfs. Graeca Halensis Dikaiomata. Papyrus Sammlung der Universität Halle. (1913).
- E. Robinson. Septuaginta. (1950).
- W. Scott. A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament. (1839).
- H. B. Swete. Hermetica. I. (1924).
- J. H. Thayer. The Old Testament in Greek. (1922).
- J. H. Thayer. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (1896).

References to the Greek Classics are taken from Loeb editions.

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS

- A. and P: R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (1913).
- C.I.G: A. Boeckhius, Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum (1828).
- Ditt. Syll: W. Dittenberger, Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum³ (1920).
- Ev. Theol: Evangelische Theologie.
- Ges. Aufs: K. Holl, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte. II (1928).
- Gort. Inscr. F. Bucheler and E. Zitelmann, Das Recht von Gortyn.
- H.D.B: J. Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible. (1898).
- I.C.C: International Critical Commentary.
- J.B.L: Journal of Biblical Literature.
- J.B.S: Journal of Biblical Studies.
- J.T.S: Journal of Theological Studies.
- KA u GV. C. von Campenhausen, Kirchliches Amt und Geistliche Vollmacht.

- KWB: G. Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (1933ff.).
- LS: H. Liddell and R. Scott, Greek-English Lexicon (1940).
- NEB: New English Bible.
- NJKA: Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum.
- P. Amh: B. P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, The Amherst Papyri. (1900ff).
- P. Gren : B. P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, Greek Papyri. Series II. (1897).
- P. Hal : Graeca Halensis Dikaiomata, Papyrus-Sammlung der Universität Halle (1913).
- P. Lond : F. G. Kenyon and others, Greek Papyri in the British Museum. (1893ff).
- P. Oxy : B. P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. (1898ff).
- P. Strass : F. Preisigke, Griechische Papyrus zu Strassburg. (1912-20).
- RHPR : Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse.
- SDSS : T. H. Gaster, The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect.

- SJT: Scottish Journal of Theology.
- SPAW: Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil. Hist. Klasse (1923).
- Str/Bill: H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum NT. aus Talmud und Midrasch I-IV (1922-28).
- Stud. Theol: Studia Theologica Lund.
- Theol. Exist. H: Theologische Existenz Heute.
- ZHT: Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie.
- ZNW: Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
- ZThK: Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche
- The Mishnah.
- | | |
|-------|-----------------|
| Ber: | Berakoth. |
| B.M: | Baba Mesia. |
| Eduy: | Eduyyoth. |
| Gitt: | Gittin. |
| Ker: | Kerithoth. |
| Ket: | Kethuboth. |
| Makk: | Makkoth. |
| Meg: | Megillah. |
| R.H: | Rosh ha-Shanah. |
| Sanh: | Sanhedrin. |
| Yad: | Yadayim. |
| Yeb: | Yebamoth. |

The Dead Sea Scrolls: CD: Damascus Document.
1QDM: Sayings of Moses.
1QH: Hymn Scroll.
1QM: War Rule.
1QpHab: Commentary on Habakkuk.
1QSa: Rule Annexe.
1QSb: Book of Blessings.